

12a7

THE
WORKS
OF
NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.
IN ELEVEN VOLUMES:

CONTAINING THE
CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;
JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES;
HISTORY OF HERETICS;
AND HIS SERMONS AND TRACTS;

WITH
GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, AND COPIOUS INDEXES.

TO THE FIRST VOLUME IS PREFIXED
THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,
BY
ANDREW KIPPIS, D.D. F.R.S. AND S.A.

VOLUME IV.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. JOHNSON, N^o 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,
M,DCC,LXXXVIII.



CHA
LXIV
LXV
LXVI

LXVII
LXVIII
LXIX
LXX
LXXI
LXXII
LXXIII
LXXIV
LXXV
LXXVI
LXXVII
LXXVIII
LXXIX
LXXX
LXXXI
LXXXII
LXXXIII
LXXXIV
LXXXV
LXXXVI
LXXXVII
LXXXVIII
LXXXIX
LXXXX

C O N T E N T S

OF THE

F O U R T H V O L U M E.

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY,

PART II. VOL. VII. VIII. IX.

CHAP.	A. D.	PAGE.
LXIV. ARNOBIUS - - - - -	306	1
LXV. LACTANTIUS - - - - -	306	24
LXVI. OF BURNING THE SCRIPTURES AND TRAITORS IN DIOCLESIAN'S PERSECUTION - - - - -	303	88
LXVII. THE DONATISTS - - - - -	...	91
LXVIII. ALEXANDER BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA - - - - -	313	103
LXIX. ARIUS AND HIS FOLLOWERS - - - - -	316	106
LXX. CONSTANTINE THE FIRST CHRISTIAN EMPEROR - - - - -	306	138
LXXI. THE COUNCIL OF NICE - - - - -	325	187
LXXII. EUSEBIUS BISHOP OF CÆSARIA - - - - -	315	200
LXXIII. MARCELLUS BISHOP OF ANCYRA IN GALATIA - - - - -	320	276
LXXIV. EUSTATHIUS BISHOP OF ANTIOCH - - - - -	320	279
LXXV. ATHANASIUS BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA - - - - -	326	280
LXXVI. A DIALOGUE AGAINST THE MARCIONITES - - - - -	330	294
LXXVII. JUVENCUS - - - - -	330	296
LXXVIII. JULIUS FIRMICUS MATERNUS - - - - -	345	297
LXXIX. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM - - - - -	348	299
LXXX. THE AUDIANS - - - - -	350	303
LXXXI. HILARY OF POICTIERS - - - - -	354	305
LXXXII. AERIUS - - - - -	360	306
LXXXIII. THE COUNCIL OF LAODICEA - - - - -	363	308
LXXXIV. EPIPHANIUS BISHOP IN CYPRUS - - - - -	368	311
LXXXV. THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS AND CANONS - - - - -	...	320
LXXXVI. RHETICIUS BISHOP OF AUTUN - - - - -	313	358
LXXXVII. TRIPHYLLIUS BISHOP IN CYPRUS - - - - -	340	359
LXXXVIII. FORTUNATIANUS BISHOP OF AQUILEIA - - - - -	340	361
VOL. IV.		

CHAP.		A.D.	PAGE
LXXXIX.	PHOTINUS - - - - -	341	361
XC.	EUSEBIUS BISHOP OF VERCELLI - - - - -	354	368
XC1.	LUCIFER BISHOP OF CAGLIARI - - - - -	354	371
XCII.	GREGORY BISHOP OF ELVIRA - - - - -	355	375
XCIII.	PHOEBADIUS BISHOP OF AGEN - - - - -	359	376
XCIV.	CAIUS MARIUS VICTORINUS AFER - - - - -	360	377
XCV.	APOLLINARIUS BISHOP OF LAODICEA - - - - -	362	380
XCVI.	DAMASUS BISHOP OF ROME - - - - -	366	397
XCVII.	BASIL BISHOP OF CÆSAREA IN CAPPADOCIA - - - - -	370	400
XCVIII.	GREGORY NAZIANZEN - - - - -	370	406
XCIX.	AMPHILOCHIUS BISHOP OF ICONIUM - - - - -	370	411
C.	GREGORY BISHOP OF NYSSA IN CAPPADOCIA - - - - -	371	415
CI.	DIDYMUS OF ALEXANDRIA - - - - -	370	420
CII.	EPHREM THE SYRIAN - - - - -	370	424
CIII.	EBEDJESU - - - - -	1285	438
CIV.	PACIAN BISHOP OF BARCELONA - - - - -	370	443
CV.	OPTATUS OF MILEVI - - - - -	370	444
CVI.	AMBROSE BISHOP OF MILAN - - - - -	374	447
CVII.	THE PRISCILLIANISTS - - - - -	378	453
CVIII.	DIODORUS BISHOP OF TARSUS - - - - -	378	491
CIX.	A COMMENTARY UPON THIRTEEN OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES - - - - -	380	495
CX.	PHILASTER BISHOP OF BRESCIA - - - - -	380	499
CXI.	GAUDENTIUS BISHOP OF BRESCIA - - - - -	387	502
CXII.	SOPHRONIUS - - - - -	390	505
CXIII.	THEODORE BISHOP OF MOPSUESTIA IN CILICIA - - - - -	394	506

E R R A T A.

Page. line.		read.	Page.	read.
30 17	_____	Damasus	225 col. 1. bottom	επιστολῶν
72 5 from bot. after for,	c.		228 col. 1. l. 1	χαριστι
78 4	_____	have in it an	259 col. 1. l. 3	εἰδος
112 7 from bottom		Nicomedia	293 col. 2. l. 6 for °	c
251 9	_____ after love,	u	294 col. 1. bottom	μαθητευθῆτων
271 16 for f	_____	g	302 col. 1. l. 19. for n	u
278 15 for d	_____	u	bottom	στη
303 16 for b	_____	h	303 col. 2. l. 7	ημεταις
17 after and,	_____	i	307 col. 2. l. 8	l
310 13 for k	_____	i	318 at the end of note °	see also H. 78. p.
319 9 for l	_____	s	1041. C.	
447 in the running title		A. D. 374.	335 col. 2. l. 2	και
IN THE NOTES.			386 note b dele vol. iv.	
58 col. 2. l. 7		corporatus	390 col. 1. 8 bottom	virginia
61 col. 1. l. 8		fine	399 note z dele vol. iv.	
77 col. 1. l. 17		esset	413 col. 2. l. 4	Τεταρτος
203 col. 2. l. 4		Agricola	453 col. 2. l. 7	fanguis

THE
C R E D I B I L I T Y
OF THE
G O S P E L H I S T O R Y;
P A R T II.

[VOL. VII. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCXLVIII.]

C H A P. LXIV.

A R N O B I U S.

I. *His history, and work, and time.* II. *His character.* III. *Select passages: 1. The sum and design of the Christian religion. 2. Arguments for the truth of the Christian religion. 3. Objections against it. 4. His notion concerning the divinity of Christ, and the Spirit. 5. Whether he was a Manichee? 6. Miracles in his time. 7. Ends of Christ's death. 8. Of Free-will. 9. Heathens offended at Cicero's works. 10. An argument for free inquiry.* IV. *His testimony to the scriptures.* V. *Extracts out of another Arnobius's Commentary upon the Psalms.*

SAYS Jerom in his Catalogue: ' Arnobius in * the time of
' the emperor Dioclesian, taught rhetoric at Sicca in Africa,
' with great reputation, and wrote those volumes against the
' Gentiles, which are well known.'

In his letter to Magnus, shewing the merit of Christian
writers; and particularly their Latin authors, he says: ' Arno-
' bius^b published seven volumes against the Gentiles, and his
' scholar Lactantius as many: who also wrote two other vo-
' lumes, Of the Wrath, and the Workmanship of God: which
' if you read, you will find in them an epitome of what is va-
' luable in the Dialogues of Cicero.'

^a Arnobius sub Diocletiano principe Sic-
cæ apud Africam florentissime rhetoricam
docuit, scripsitque adversus Gentes quæ
vulgo extant volumina. De V. I. c. 79.

^b Septem libros adversus Gentes Arno-

bis edidit, totidemque discipulus ejus Lac-
tantius, qui de Ira quoque & Opificio Dei
duo volumina condidit: quos si legere vo-
lueris, dialogorum Ciceronis in eis cassidem
reperies. Ep. 83.

In another place Jerom passeth a severe and ill-natured censure upon Arnobius's performance, saying, that ^c he is unequal and prolix, and for want of divisions of his work (A) confused.

Arnobius is likewise mentioned by Jerom ^d with some other learned ecclesiastical writers, who, he says, ought to be read with discretion, taking what is good in them, and rejecting what is bad.

In Jerom's Chronicle at the 20th year of Constantine, or the year of Christ 326, are these words: ' Arnobius ^e a rhetorician is famous in Africa, who while he taught the youth rhetoric at Sicca, and was yet a heathen, was admonished in his dreams to embrace Christianity. But when he applied to the bishop of the place for baptism, he rejected him, because he had been wont to oppose the Christian doctrine. Whereupon he composed an excellent work against his old religion, and thus at length, as by hostages of his piety, he obtained the seal of the covenant.'

According to this account, Arnobius's work against the Gentiles was composed by him, whilst a catechumen only, and before he was a complete Christian. Nay, Tillemont from this passage argues, that ^f Arnobius was not baptized, nor so much as a catechumen. And Cave too, without hesitation says, that ^g ' he was not then so much as a catechumen, instructed in the first rudiments of the faith.'

But each of those suppositions appears to me inconsistent with Arnobius's ordinary style, who continually speaks of himself as a Christian, and reckons himself one of them. Many such passages might be alleged; and I put ^h a few in the margin: but it is the whole strain of the work.

^c Arnobius inæqualis & nimius, & absque operis sui partitione confusus. Ad Paulin Ep. 49. al. 13. T. 4. p. 567.

(A) Cave, in his English life of Arnobius, at the end of his second volume of *The Lives of the Fathers*, says: ' His style, though censured by Jerom, is yet sufficiently elegant.—Nor is his work so confused and immethodical, as that father seems to insinuate: as is evident to any that will be at the pains attentively to read it, and observe how his design is laid, his argument prosecuted, and how the several parts of it do naturally enough one depend upon another.' So Cave.

^d Ego Originem propter eruditionem sic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum, Novatum, Arnobium, & nonnullos ecclesiasticos scriptores Græcos

pariter & Latinos: ut bona eorum eligamus, vitæque contraria. Hier. Ep. 56. al. 76. T. 4. p. 589.

^e Arnobius rhetor clarus in Africa habetur. Qui quum in civitate Sicca: ad declamandum juvenes erudiret, & adhuc ethnicus ad credulitatem somniis compelleretur, neque ab episcopo obtineret fidem, quam semper oppugnaverat, elucubravit adversus pristinam religionem luculentissimos libros, & tandem velut quibusdam obsidibus pietatis fœdus impetavit. Chr. l. ii. p. 181.

^f —puisque c'est la production d'un homme qui n'étoit baptizé, ou qui même n'étoit pas encore catechumene. Tillem. Arnobe. Mem. Ec. T. 4. P. 2. p. 1209.

^g See Cave's life of Arnobius in English, as above, p. 2. at the bottom.

^h Nihil sumus aliud Christiani, l. i. p. 41. f. Nationibus enim

It may be argued likewise, that he was not barely a catechumen at that time, from ¹ the description he gives of the Christian worship in their assemblies: not only discourses, but prayers likewise; at which last, as is generally said, catechumens were not allowed to be present.

Indeed I do not see how Arnobius could so confidently assert the innocence and usefulness of every part of Christian worship, as he does, if he was not fully acquainted with it. Not to add, that it would seem a very extraordinary step, for a man to undertake the public defence of a religion, who did not understand the rudiments of it.

I must therefore take the liberty to say, that I cannot but question the genuineness of that passage.

That Arnobius was once a blind and zealous idolater, is fully owned and confessed by ^k himself. And he professeth to have been taught by Christ, or that Christ was his master. But I do not perceive him any where to ascribe his conversion to dreams, by which he had been admonished whilst a heathen. Nor does Jerom elsewhere mention, or hint at that matter. It is also observable, that in Jerom's Catalogue, Arnobius is said to have flourished in the time of Dioclesian; whereas in the passage in the Chronicle, he is placed at the twentieth year of Constantine. And if Arnobius had been in the circumstances intimated in that passage, he must have been intent upon dispatch. But it is manifest from the work itself, that it is no hasty performance, but a laboured composition, fit to see the light: and many authors, both Greek and Latin, are here ^l quoted. Nor has Arnobius any where hinted, that he was under any sort of compulsion or necessity to engage in this work. But at the beginning he speaks of his undertaking as

sumus in cunctis, p. 10. m. Audetis nos ridere —! l. ii. p. 51. Non ergo quod sequimur novum est, sed nos sero addidimus, ib. p. 95. & passim.

^k Nam nostra quidem scripta cur ignibus meruerunt dari? cur immaniter conventicula dirui? in quibus summus oratur Deus, pax cunctis & venia postulatur magistratibus, exercitibus, regibus, familiaribus, inimicis, adhuc vitam de gentibus, & resolutis corporum vincione: in quibus aliud auditur nihil, nisi quod humanos faciat, nisi quod mites, verecundos, pudicos, castos, familiaris communicatores rei, & cum omnibus consolidæ germanitatis necessitudine copulatos. Arnob. l. iv. p. 152. Lugdun. Bat. 1651. Vid. & lib. i. p. 14. f. 15. in.

^l Venerabar, ô cæcitas, nuper simulachra

modo ex fornacibus prompta, in incudibus deos, & ex malleis fabricatos: elephantorum ossa, picturatas veterneis in arboribus tærnias si quando conspexeram, lubricatum lapidem & ex olivi unguine sordidatum, tanquam inesset vis præsens, adulabar, affabar, & beneficia poscebam nihil sentiente de trunco. — Nunc doctore tanto in vias veritatis inductus, omnia ista, quæ sint, scio: digna de dignis sentio, contumeliam nomini nullam facio divino: & quid cuique debeatur, vel personæ, vel capiti, inconfusus gradibus atque auctoritatibus tribuo. Id. l. i. p. 22, 23.

^l Catalogues of authors quoted by Arnobius may be seen in Fabr. Bib. Lat. Vol. iii. p. 391. &c. Nourry Apparat. Tom. ii. p. 537, &c.

perfectly free and voluntary; and says, that ^m some injurious reproaches cast upon the Christians, induced him to write in their defence.

Add these considerations to that before-mentioned, that Arnobius writes as a Christian; and it must I think, appear somewhat probable, that Jerom was not the author of that article in the Chronicle; and that it was inserted after his time by some credulous person, not thoroughly acquainted with Arnobius's history, or work.

According to Cave, Arnobius flourished about the year 303. However, it is not easy to settle exactly the time of the work he has left us.

Tillemont is inclined to the year ⁿ 297, or sooner: whom ^o Beausobre follows, supposing Arnobius to have written in 295. Basnage ^p thinks the year 303, or 304, more likely.

The article in Jerom's Chronicle, whether his or not, seems to deserve but little regard. Arnobius must be there wrong placed, at the year of Christ 325 or 326; for in his Catalogue Jerom says, that Arnobius flourished under Dioclesian, and that Lactantius, Arnobius's scholar, was appointed professor of rhetoric at Nicomedia under the same emperor: which must be understood to have been done before the persecution which began in 302 or 303. For after that it cannot be supposed, that Dioclesian would invite a Christian to come and settle in the city, where his palace was.

There are some notes of time in the work itself. For Arnobius says, that ^q it was then three hundred years, more or less, since the rise of Christianity. And heathens are brought in objecting, that ^r the Christian religion had not a being four hundred years ago. And soon after it is said to be ^s a thousand and fifty years since the foundation of Rome, or thereabout.

Following the ordinary computation of that epoch, Arnobius must have written in the year of our Lord 297, or 298. And ^t Pagi was once of opinion, that Arnobius's books were published in the year of Christ 298, or 299, at the latest. But afterwards observing, that Arnobius useth words denoting such suf-

^m Quoniam, comperi nonnullos—statui pro capiti & mediocritate sermonis contrahere invidiam & calumniosas dissolvere criminationes, l. i. in. ⁿ Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. 3. p. 1210. & 1374.

^o Hist. de Manich. T. ii. p. 412. Note (7.)

^p Annal. 303. n. 24. ^q Trecenti sunt anni, minus vel plus aliquid, ex quo cepimus esse Christiani, & terrarum in

orbe censei, l. i. p. 9. in.

^r Ante quadringentos annos religio, inquit, vestra non fuit, l. ii. p. 94. in.

^s Etatis urbs Roma cujus esse in annalibus indicitur? Annos ducit quinquaginta & mille, aut non multum ab his minus, l. ii. p. 94. infr. m.

^t Pagi in Baron. Ann. 302. n. 14, 15, 16.

ferings as followed Dioclesian's edict for a general persecution, he was induced to alter his mind, and to conclude, that he did not write till after the year 302. And from hence he was led to infer, that Arnobius followed another, and very uncommon computation of the Roman æra, which placeth the foundation of the city thirteen years later than the Varronian account. Consequently Arnobius wrote in the year of Christ 310, which, according to the last mentioned computation, is in the 1050th year of Rome.

I think, that if the demolition of the churches, and the burning of the Christian scriptures, and other afflictions of Christians for the sake of their principles, which ^u Arnobius speaks of, relate to the persecution under Dioclesian; Arnobius could not write till the year 303, or after. Nevertheless, as he speaks in a loose and general manner, both of the time of the rise of Christianity, and of the foundation of the city; I see no reason to conclude, that he made use of a different computation from the common. For though it were then 1056 or 1057 years from the foundation of Rome, (according to the common computation, and that too followed by him;) he might express himself as he has done, or say, it was about 1050 years.

It may be reckoned somewhat strange, that Lactantius, when ^{*} he mentions the Latin Christian apologists, Minucius, Tertullian, and Cyprian, should take no notice of Arnobius; if he was his master, as Jerom says in his Catalogue, and if he wrote before him.

With regard to this difficulty, I would say, Lactantius appears to be so honest and generous a man, that I cannot impute his silence to envy, or any other bad principle. Indeed, according to the whole strain of Arnobius's work, he wrote, when Christianity was under discouragements, and therefore before the sun-shine of Constantine's reign: whereas it is a common opinion, that the Institutions of Lactantius, written against the Gentiles, were not published, as we now have them, before the year 319, or 320, or 321. But however that may be, I think it probable, that the main part of the Institutions was written during the time of Dioclesian's persecution; when Lactantius might be intirely ignorant of what Arnobius had done, or was doing in Africa, at a great distance from him. For they might be both writing at one and the same time, without any communication of their several designs to each other, and without a possibility of it. Arnobius was a heathen

^u See before note (i) p. 3.

^{*} Inst. l. v. c. 1. p. 459.

a good while. His work is the work of a man of vast reading, and of a mature age at least. Nor have we any account of any thing done by him afterwards: possibly he was then far advanced in life, and died soon after. And if his books were not composed before the year of our Lord 305, or 306, Lactantius, probably, would be intirely unacquainted with them, when he wrote his Institutions. Moreover, supposing the persecution to have been begun before Arnobius's work was composed, there might be no fair opportunity to make it public, till that affliction ceased.

Cave^y and some others say, that Arnobius did not write till after the beginning of Dioclesian's persecution. And it is certain, that he not only often speaks of the afflictions endured by Christians, but as if they suffered at the very time: for he prays to God^z to forgive those that persecuted his servants; and he sometimes speaks of their sufferings in the present^a tense. If the persecution was begun before he was converted, and set about his work, it must have raged for some good while, before his Apology was finished. Consequently, it could not be written, much less published, quite so soon as some have thought.

Upon the whole I am inclined to think, without being positive, that Arnobius did not write till some time after the beginning of the persecution ordered by Dioclesian, possibly about the year 305, or 306.

Were we inquiring, at what time Arnobius flourished as a rhetorician, I should make no scruple to say, that he flourished about the year 290, or sooner. But as our inquiry is, when he wrote for the Christians, we place him somewhat lower.

Though Arnobius has quoted a large number of Greek and Roman authors, he has not mentioned any Christian writers. Some think, that^b he made great use of Clement of Alexandria: but he has not named him.

It is supposed, that^c this work is not come down to us complete; but that somewhat is wanting at the end, if not also at the beginning.

Arnobius's books against the Gentiles have never yet been divided into chapters or smaller sections: though as^d Nourry

^y Scripti enim sunt hi libri anno 303, vel non diu post, exorta jam persecutione. Cave H. L. in Arnobio. ^z Da veniam, rex summe, tuos persequentibus servos, &c. l. i. p. 18. in. ^a Vid. l. ii. p. 44, 45. ^b Vid. Nourry, Diff. in Arnob. in App. T. ii. p. 490. C. 481, 482, 487. C. D. 491. D. E. & 492.

^c Id. ib. p. 287. D. E. ^d Quapropter si quis in nova aliqua horum librorum editione, eos, quod non ita difficile est, in capita aut sectiones distribuatur; is sane & huic confusio medebitur, & tedium laboremque lectoris plurimum sublevabit. Id. ib. p. 287. C.

says, it might be easily done, and would remove the seeming confusion which there is in the method, and render the reading of this author more agreeable. However, as yet we have only the original division of this work into seven books.

There is another of this name, author of Brief Commentaries upon the 150 Psalms, formerly supposed the same with our Arnobius, but now universally allowed by learned men to be a different person, and to have lived in the fifth century, about the year 461.

I design at the end of this chapter to insert a brief account of his testimony to the scriptures.

II. Having given a general account of Arnobius, and his work, I shall add some things to illustrate his character.

It has been often said of Arnobius and Lactantius, that^f they undertook the defence of Christianity before they understood it. In answer to which it is observed by a learned and judicious writer, 'That^e this must be understood of the Christian system, as to doctrines and precepts: which it is not to be wondered, if he was not perfectly acquainted with, since he wrote his books before he was admitted by baptism into the church, and fully instructed in those points. But as to the general evidence of Christianity, that he understood very well, and by his knowledge and serious consideration of it, embraced the faith in that discouraging season the reign of Dioclesian.'

I wish that vindication of our Christian apologist had been more complete. For in order to judge of the evidence of a religion, it seems requisite, that a man understand its doctrines; or what it teaches, and consists of. Nor do I perceive, how Arnobius could be acquainted with our Lord's works, or miracles, and not also know his^h words, or the doctrines and precepts of the Christian religion.

I observe then, that Arnobius knew and believed the several following things: 1. Heⁱ believed in one God Almighty, the creator of all things. 2. He believed, that^k Jesus Christ came from God, and that he proved his divine commission. 3. He was acquainted with^{*} the sublime morality taught by our Saviour on the mount and elsewhere. 4. He believed, that[†]

^e Cave Hist. L. in Arnobio Juniore.

^f See Mr. Warburton's Divine Legation, Vol. i. p. 3. ^g See Dr. Chapman's Eusebius, Vol. i. p. 272.

^h Neque enim qualitas & deformitas mortis dicta ejus immutat aut facta, l. i. p. 23. m. Vid. & p. 6. in.

ⁱ Audetis

ridere nos, quod Patrem rerum & Deum veneramus & colimus, quodque illi dedamus & permittamus spes nostras? l. ii. p. 51. m. & alibi passim.

^k — rei maximæ causa a summo rege ad nos missus, l. i. p. 24. & passim. ^{*} Ib. p. 5. & 6.

[†] Sed si, inquit, Christus in hoc missus

Jesus Christ came to save lost sinners: 5. And that¹ he promised eternal life, and gave full assurance of his being able to perform what he promised. 6. He likewise^m believed and expected the resurrection of the dead. 7. He knew thatⁿ the gospel of Christ, or the Christian religion, did not make promises of temporal, earthly blessings; but taught men to bear afflictions, and even death itself, with meekness, patience and fortitude. 8. And finally, he was so fully persuaded of the real excellence and manifest certainty of the Christian religion, as to say, that^o it needed not any apology, but stood firm upon the foundation of its own truth and reasonableness, though all the world should gainsay it. He had therefore considered the internal, as well as the external evidence of Christianity.

A man who knew all these things, and was acquainted with the history of our Lord's life, death, and resurrection, and his and his apostles miracles; I think may be esteemed sufficiently qualified to write a defence of the Christian religion. Indeed, the faith of the ancient apologists, and other primitive Christians, was in some respects more plain and simple than ours: but it was a faith, that^p produced good works, that taught them self-denial, and made martyrs. Nor was it, possibly, because of its plainness and simplicity, the less conformable to

a Deo est, ut infelices animas ab interitionis exitio liberaret, — l. ii. p. 87.

¹ Ut enim dii certi certas apud vos habent tutelas, licentias, potestates, — ita unus pontificum Christi est, dare animis salutem, & spiritum perpetuitatis apponere, l. ii. p. 89.

Si nobis hæc gaudia, hoc est, viam fugiendæ mortis, Plato in Phædo promississet, aliudve ex hoc choro, possetque eam præstare, atque ad finem pollicitationis adducere; consentaneum fuerat ejus suscipere nos cultus, a quo tantum doni expectaremus & muneris. Nunc cum eam Christus non tantum promiserit, verum etiam virtutibus tantis manifestaverit posse compleri: quid alienum facimus, aut stultitiæ crimen quibus rationibus sustinemus, si ejus nomini, majestatique substernimur, a quo speramus utrumque, & mortem cruciabilem fugere, & vitæ æternitate donari? l. ii. p. 66, 67.

^m Audetis ridere nos, quod mortuorum dicamus resurrectionem futuram? l. ii. p. 51.

ⁿ Nihil enim est nobis promissum ad hanc vitam, nec in caruncula hujus folliculo constitutis opis aliquid sponsum est auxilii que decretum. Quinimo edocti sumus minas omnes, quæcumque sunt, parvi ducere atque æstimare fortunæ. Ac si quando

ingruerit vis quæpiam gravior, qua finem necesse sit consequi vitæ, eam nec timere, nec fugere, — l. ii. p. 98.

^o Neque enim res stare sine assertoribus non potest & religio Christiana: aut eo esse comprobabitur vera, si adspulatores habuerit plurimos, & auctoritatem ab hominibus sumserit. Suis illa contenta est viribus, & veritatis propriæ fundaminibus nititur. Nec spoliatur vi sua, etiam si nullum habeat vindicem: immo si linguæ omnes contra faciant, contraque nitantur, & ad fidem illius abrogandam consensionis unitæ animositate conspiciant, l. iii. in. p. 100.

^p Οὐ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργοις τὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας πράγματα. Just. M. ad Gr. Coh. p. 33. B. Οὐ γὰρ μέλην λόγῳ, ἀλλ' ἐπιδείξει καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ ἔργῳ τὰ ἡμετέρα. Athenag. leg. p. 37. B. vid. ib. p. 12. A. Nos non habitu sapientiam, sed mente præferimus. Non eloquimur magna, sed vivimus. Min. Fel. cap. 38. Nos autem, — qui philosophi non verbis sed factis sumus, nec vestitu sapientiam sed veritate præferimus, — qui non loquimur magna, sed vivimus. Cyp. De Bono Sap. sub init. Nostro autem populo, quid horum potest objici, cujus omnis religio est, sine scelere, & sine macula vivere. Laët. Inst. l. 5. cap. 9. sub fin.

the

the Christian doctrine contained in the New Testament, which is summarily set forth by St. Paul in these words: *For the grace of God that bringeth salvation, or the salutary, saving grace of God, has appeared unto all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for the blessed hope, and the appearance of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ: who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.* Tit. ii. 11—14. But to proceed.

Another learned modern speaks of Arnobius after this manner: 'He⁹ was very shy of determining abstruse and difficult points of a speculative nature. He supposed the Christian religion to consist in the clear and certain doctrine of our Saviour, omitting whatever is not plainly taught by him. Far from being curious and dogmatical, he was timorous and reserved: which, perhaps, is no great fault; for it is the deciding positive temper, that produceth sects and schisms.'

Arnobius was learned and pious; as every one must perceive, who looks into him. And though his style is generally reckoned rough and unpolished, and hath in it some uncouth and obsolete words; it is strong and nervous, and^r there are in him shining and beautiful passages, which must highly please attentive readers of good taste. It is very much to the honour of this rhetorician, learned in all^s the learning of Greece and Rome, that he embraced the Christian religion when under persecution: and that like Moses, *he chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season: esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches, than the treasures of all the world.* Heb. xi. 25, 26. And see Acts vii. 22.

III. I shall now make some extracts out of Arnobius. 1. He represents the sum of the Christian religion in this manner: 'We^t Christians are men that worship the great Lord and go-

⁹ Tout cela, selon lui, sont des questions vaines & curieuses, qu'il est impossible de déterminer, parceque la raison humaine manque de lumieres suffisantes pour cela, & que le Fils de Dieu ne s'est point expliqué la-dessus. Arnobe faisoit consister la religion Chrétienne dans la doctrine claire & certain du Sauveur, & en retranchoit tout ce qu'il n'a pas enseigné avec évidence. On peut bien croire que je n'approuve pas les hypothèses d'Arnobe. Mais pourquoi faut-il, que les anciens aient été égarés d'un esprit aussi curieux & aussi décisif que celui du savant Arnobe étoit timide & re-

servé? C'est cet esprit décisif, qui a fait naître tant de sectes & schismes. Beaus. Hist. de Manich. T. ii. p. 415.

^r Negari tamen non potest, plurima passim occurrere apte, polite, eleganter & rhetorice dicta, ac gravissimis ornata illustrataque verbis & sententiis. Nourry Diff. in Arnob. cap. ii. p. 287. A. B. ^s Quem quidem locum plene jamdudum homines pectoris vivi tam Romanis literis explicavere quam Græcis, l. iii. p. 103.

^t Nihil sumus aliud Christiani, nisi magistro Christo summi regis & principis veneratores. Nihil, si consideres, aliud invenies in ista religione

^v vernor

‘vernor of the world, according to the direction of Jesus
 ‘Christ. If you examine it, you will find nothing else in this
 ‘religion: this is the sum of the whole affair: this is the scope
 ‘and design of all our religious offices: to this supreme Lord
 ‘we all bow down: him we worship with united prayers: to
 ‘him we present holy, and innocent, and honourable requests,
 ‘fit to be heard by him.’

I place ^u another like passage at the bottom of the page, without translating it, but referring it to the consideration of my readers.

2. It is worth while to observe, what arguments Arnobius makes use of to prove the truth and divine original of the Christian religion.

1.) One argument insisted on by him is its excellence. For this I would refer to what was before said ^x concerning Arnobius’s knowledge of the Christian religion and its evidences, and to his passages just alleged, containing his summary accounts of the great design of it. I might also refer to other passages, where ^y he insists upon those laws of Christ, which teach men to bear injuries, and not to return evil for evil: as likewise to some other places, where ^z he puts the heathens in mind of the innocence of Christ himself, and of his whole undertaking: which, as he tells them, is alone sufficient to shew, how unreasonable their fierce opposition against him was. And there are in him many other passages to the same purpose, which will offer themselves to an attentive reader.

2.) He insists ^a upon the virtues of our Lord’s life, and the perfection and amiableness of his conduct upon all occasions.

versari. Hæc totius summa est actionis. Hic propositus terminus divinatorum officiorum, hic finis. Huic omnes ex more prosternuntur, huic collatis precibus adoramus. Ab hoc iusta, & honesta, & auditu ejus condigna deprecemur, l. i. p. 14. & 15.

^u Qui [Christus] si dignus non esset, cui auscultare deberetur, ut credere; vel hoc ipso fuerat non aspernandus a vobis, ostenderet quod vias vobis ad cælum & vota immortalitatis optaret, — qui hominibus cæcis, & rêvera in impietate degentibus, pietatis aperuit januas, & cui se submitterent indicavit? An ulla est religio verior, officiosior, potentior, justior, quam Deum principem nosse, seise Deo principi supplicare, qui bonorum omnium solus caput & fons est, perpetuarum pariter fundator & conditor rerum, a quo omnia terrena, cunctaque cælestia animantur, — & qui si non esset, nulla profecto res esset, quæ

aliquod nomen, substantiamque portaret? l. ii. p. 42, 43. Vid. & p. 13. f.

^x See p. 7, 8. ^y Nam cum hominum vis tanta magisterii ejus acceperimus ac legibus, malum malo rependi non oportere; injuriam perpeti quam irrogare præstantius, l. i. p. 6. in.

^z — quid causa est, quod tam gravibus insectamini Christum bellis? Numquid regiam sibi vindicans potestatem, terrarum orbem cunctum legionibus infestissimis occupavit? — Numquid ardoribus avaritiæ flagrans universas opes illas, quibus se genus humanum studi-ose contendit impleri, possessionis suæ mancipio vindicavit? Numquid — l. ii. p. 42.

^a Ipse denique non lenis, non placidus, non accessu facilis non familiaris assatu, non humanas miseras indolefcens, omnes omnino crucibus & corporalibus affectibus malis unica illa benignitate miseratus reddidit & restituit sanitatem? Quid ergo vos subigit,

3.) Another argument is taken from our Lord's miracles. Several of the passages where Arnobius speaks of them, will be produced hereafter, in the article of his testimony to the scriptures. He observes particularly, that ^b our Lord's great works were very numerous, and were performed without the use of any external means, and were healing and beneficial: that ^c they were performed without show and ostentation, in order to convince, if possible, a hard-hearted and unbelieving race of men, of the truth of the doctrine taught by him. He likewise observes, that ^d Christ discovered a knowledge of men's inward thoughts: that ^e after he had been put to death, he rose again, and shewed himself to many. He farther ^f insists largely upon our Saviour's conferring a like power of doing miracles, equal to all those which had been done by himself, upon his disciples, who were poor fishermen, or of other low occupations, ignorant, illiterate, and unskilful: a full proof, he says, that those works were not the effect of magic, or any human art, but of the power of God. And whereas some might be apt to insinuate, that the writers of our Lord's history had magnified his works beyond the reality; he answers, that ^g they had related but a small part of them. And he wisheth they had recorded them all, if it had been possible, and likewise all the miracles of his disciples, the more to increase the astonishment and wonder of such incredulous men. He

quid hortatur, maledicere — quem redarguere, quem tenere, nemo hominum possit ullius facinoris in reatu? l. i. p. 39.

^b Potestis aliquem nobis designare, monstrare ex omnibus illis magis, qui unquam fuisse per sæcula, consimile aliquid Christo millesima ex parte qui fecerit? qui sine ulla vi carminum, sine herbarum & graminum succis, —? Atqui constitit Christum sine ullis adminiculis rerum, sine ullius ritus observatione, vel lege, omnia illa quæ fecit, nominis sui possibilitate fecisse: & quod proprium, consentaneum, dignum Deo fuerat vero, nihil nocens, aut noxium, sed opiferum, sed salutare, sed auxiliaribus plenum bonis potestatis munificæ liberalitate donasse, l. i. p. 25.

^c Quæ quidem ab eo gesta sunt, & facilitata, non ut se vana ostentatione jactaret, sed ut homines duri atque increduli scirent, non esse quod spondebatur falsum, l. i. p. 27.

^d Unus fuit e nobis, qui quid singuli voverent, quid sub obscuris cogitationibus continerent, tacitorum in cordibus pervidebat? p. 27. in.

^e Unus fuit e nobis, qui deposito corpore innumeris se hominum promissa in luce detexit? p. 27.

^f Quid quod istas virtutes, quæ sunt a nobis sum-

matim, non ut rei poscebat magnitudo, depromtæ, non tantum ipse perfecit vi sua, verum quod erat sublimius, multos alios experiri, & facere sui nominis cum affectione permisit. Nam cum videret futuros vos esse gestarum ab se rerum, divinique operis abrogatores, ne qua subesset suspicio, magicis se artibus munera illa beneficiaque largitum, ex immensa illa populi multitudine, quæ suam gratiam sectabatur admirans, piscatores, opifices, rusticanos, atque id genus elegit imperitorum, qui per varias gentes missi cuncta illa miracula sine ullis fucis atque adminiculis perpetrarent. — Neque quicquam est ab illo gestum per admirationem stupentibus cunctis, quod non omne donaverit parvulis illis & rusticis, & eorum subjecerit potestati, p. 30. Vid. & p. 32.

^g Sed conscriptores nostri mendaciter ista promiserunt, extulere in immensum exigua gesta, & angustas res satis ambitioso dilatavere præconio. Atqui utinam cuncta referri in scripta potuissent, vel quæ ab ipso gesta sunt, vel quæ ab ejus præconibus pari jure & potentia terminata. Magis vos incredulos faceret vis tanta virtutum. — l. i. p. 33.

particularly

particularly asserts, that ^b the miracles done by Christ himself, and by his apostles, whom he sent forth to preach in his name, are a just foundation of faith in him, as a divine messenger. And he says, that ⁱ those great works had excited the attention of all mankind, and induced distant nations, and people of very different manners and customs, to unite in respect for his high character.

I presume it will be allowed, that Arnobius has done justice to this argument, and treated it in a handsome manner.

4.) He argues ^k from the great effect of the Christian religion upon men, in softening their tempers, amending their manners, sowing the seeds and principles of benevolence, peace and friendship, among men. Which advantages, he says, would have been greater, and more general, provided all, who made an appearance of being men, would have exercised their rational powers and faculties, and would have laid aside their prejudices, and their pride, and would have candidly attended to the doctrine of Christ. Then wars and disturbances might have ceased in the earth.

He observes particularly, and with much thankfulness, that ^l Christ had delivered men from great errors: he had brought them from idolatry to the knowledge of the true God, and taught them how to worship, and pray to him.

5.) Another argument insisted on by him is ^m the great progress of the Christian doctrine, and the vast numbers of people

^b Atque si causas causas, partes partibus voverimus aquare, magis nos valemus ostendere, quid in Christo fuerimus secuti, quam in philosophis quid vos. Ac nos quidem in illo secuti hæc sumus: opera illa magnifica, potentissimæque virtutes, quas variis edidit exhibuitque miraculis, quibus quivis posset ad necessitatem credulitatis adduci, & judicare fideliter, non esse quæ fierent hominis, sed divinæ alicujus atque incognitæ virtutis. Vos in philosophis virtutes secuti quas estis, — ? l. ii. p. 49.

ⁱ Virtutes sub oculis positæ, & inaudita illa vis rerum, vel quæ ab ipso fiebat palam, vel ab ejus præconibus celebratur in orbe toto, ea subdidit appetitionum flammæ, ut ad unius credulitatis assensum mente una concurrere gentes & populos fecit, & moribus dissimillimas nationes, ib. p. 50.

^k Habet a Christo beneficium jamdudum orbis ingratus, per quem feritatis mollita est rabies, atque hostiles manus cohibere a sanguine cognati animantis occæpit. Quod si omnes omnino, qui homines se esse non specie corporum, sed rationis intelligunt potestate, salutaribus ejus pacificisque de-

cretis aurem vellent commodare paulisper, & non fastu & supercilio luminis — universus jamdudum orbis mitiora in opera conversis ulibus ferri, tranquillitate in mollissima degeret, & in concordiam salutarem incorruptis fœderum sanctionibus conveniret, l. i. p. 6.

^l — honoribus quantis afficiendus est nobis, qui ab erroribus nos magnis insinuata veritate traduxit? qui velut cæcos passim, ac sine ullo rectore gradientes, ab deruptis, ab deviis, locis planioribus reddidit. Qui, quod frugiferum primo atque humano generi salutare, Deus monstravit quid sit, quis, quantus, qualis: — Qui, quod omnia superavit, & transgressum est munera, ab religionibus nos falsis religionem traduxit ad veram. Qui ab signis, inertibus atque ex vilissimo formatis luto ad sidera sublevarit & cælum, & cum Domino rerum Deo supplicationum fecit verba atque orationum colloquia miscere, l. i. p. 21, 22.

^m Si Alamannos, Persas, Scythas, idcirco voluerunt devinci, quod habitarent in eorum gentibus Christiani: quemadmodum Romanis tribuere victoriam, cum habitarent & degerent in eorum quo-

that

that had embraced it in many and remote kingdoms of the earth, in a very short time. He says, that there were then Christians in all countries: he particularly mentions Syria, Persia, Scythia, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and divers other people and countries; some under the Roman government, others out of it.

The dignity of our Lord's person, he ⁿ says, and the divine original of his religion, must be hence manifest, that in so short a time he filled the whole world with that doctrine.

6.) This argument is confirmed, forasmuch ^o as this religion had been embraced under the greatest difficulties and discouragements by men of all ranks; by orators, grammarians, rhetoricians, lawyers, physicians, philosophers, and the greatest wits, as well as by men of low condition, and smaller attainments. Nor could the heaviest sufferings induce men to renounce it. Yea, this doctrine continued to spread, and make converts, at the very time that the professors of it endured a cruel persecution.

7.) He argues, that ^p it would be altogether absurd to suppose, that so many people should on a sudden, without any good ground and reason, change their former opinions and customs, and forsake the religion of their ancestors. They

que gentibus Christiani? Si in Asia, Syria, — quod ratione consimili habitarent in eorum gentibus Christiani? in Hispania, Gallia, cur eodem tempore horum nihil natum est, cum innumeri viverent in his quoque provinciis Christiani? Si apud Getulos, Tinguitanos, hujus rei causa siccitatem satis ariditatemque miserunt: eo anno cur messes amplissimas Mauris, Nomadibusque tribuerunt, cum religio similis his quoque in regionibus verteretur? — nationibus enim sumus in cunctis, l. i. p. 9, 10.

ⁿ Unus fuit e nobis, qui cum officia religionis certæ suis sectatoribus traderet, mundum totum repente complebat, quantusque, & qui esset, revelata nominis immensitate monstrabat? l. i. p. 27. in.

* Nonne vel hæc saltem fidem vobis faciunt argumenta credendi, quod jam per omnes terras, in tam brevi temporis spatio, immensi nominis hujus sacramenta diffusa sunt? quod nulla jam natio est tam barbari moris, & mansuetudinem nesciens, quæ non ejus amore versa molliverit asperitatem, & in placidos census assumpta tranquillitate migravit? quod tam magnis ingeniis præditi oratores, grammatici, rhetores, consulti juris, ac medici, philosophiæ etiam secreta rimantes, magisteria hæc expetant, spreto quibus paulo ante fidebant? quod ab dominis se servi cruciatibus affici, quibus

statuerint, malunt, solvi conjuges matrimoniis, exheridari a parentibus liberi, quam fidem rumpere Christianum, & salutaria militiæ sacramenta deponere? quod cum genera poenarum tanta sint a vobis proposita religionis hujus sequentibus leges, augeatur res magis, & contra omnes minas atque interdicta formidinum animosius populus obnitatur, & ad credendi studium prohibitionis ipsius stimulis excitetur? An numquid hæc fieri passim & inaniter creditis? fortuitis cursibus adsumi has mentes? Itane istud non divinum & sacrum est, aut sine Deo, eorum tantas animorum fieri conversiones, ut cum carnifices unci, alique innumeri cruciatus, quemadmodum diximus, impendeant credituris, veluti quadam dulcedine atque omnium virtutum amore correpti, cognitas, accipiant rationes, atque mundi omnibus rebus præponant amicitias Christi? l. ii. p. 44, 45.

^p Nulla major est comprobatio, quam gestarum ab eo fides rerum, quam virtutum novitas, quam omnia victa decreta, dissolutaque fatalia, quæ populi gentesque suo geri sub lumine nullo dissentiente videre: quæ nec ipsi audent falsitatis arguere, quorum antiquas seu patrias leges vanitatis esse plenissimas atque inanissimæ superstitionis ostendit, l. i. p. 24, 25.

had

had therefore good proof and evidence of the great works said to be done by Christ.

It is still the more unreasonable, as he argues, to suppose, that ^a men should act here without good evidence; when it is considered, that by change of sentiment, and embracing this doctrine, they exposed themselves to the greatest dangers, and the heaviest sufferings.

8.) Finally, he argues, that ^r the things said of Christ must be true; forasmuch as they who first reported, or recorded them, had no interest to induce them to falsify, and by only not bearing testimony to him, they might have avoided many sufferings, and have lived quietly and comfortably among their neighbours. Would men in such a circumstance, pretend to have seen what they never saw? and assert facts they had no knowledge of? Would men bring upon themselves enmity and hatred, and expose themselves to universal infamy, for no reason at all? They were therefore fully persuaded of the things they related, and knew them to be true.

I have allowed myself to enlarge in these extracts; for I think no one can be displeased to see, how solidly this Christian rhetorician and apologist argued above a thousand, almost fifteen hundred years ago, in behalf of the religion of Jesus, whose disciples we profess ourselves to be.

3. Let us now attend to the objections, or at least some of the objections against the Christian religion, which we find to be taken notice of and considered by this writer.

I have not observed any notice taken by Arnobius of those scandalous imputations upon the Christians, of sacrificing young children, and practising promiscuous lewdness in their religious assemblies. It is likely therefore, that the Christians had so fully confuted those stories, and all men were so fully satisfied of their falshood, that they were no longer mentioned by the enemies of the Christian religion. Our author indeed speaks ^s

^a Quod si falsa, ut dicitis, historia illa rerum est, unde tam brevi tempore totus mundus ista religione completus est? aut in unam coire qui potuerunt mentem gentes regionibus distat, ventis, cæli convexionibus dimotæ? Asseverationibus illeclæ sunt nudis, induclæ in spes cassas, & in pericula capitis immittere se sponte temeraria desperatione voluerunt, cum nihil tale vidissent, quod eas in hos cultus novitatis fæe possit excitare miraculo? Imo quia hæc omnia & ab ipso cernebant geri & ab ejus præconibus, qui per orbem missi beneficia patris & munera sanandis animis homini-

busque portabant, veritatis ipsius vi victæ, & dederunt se Deo, nec in magnis posuere dispendiis membra vobis projicere, & viscera sua lanianda præbere, l. i. p. 33.

^r An numquid dicemus, illius temporis homines usque adeo fuisse vanos, mendaces, stolidos, brutos, ut quæ nunquam viderant, vidisse se fingerent? & quæ facta omnino non erant, falsis proderent testimoniis, aut puerili assertionem firmarent? cumque possent vobiscum & unanimiter vivere, & inoffensas ducere conjunctiones, gratuita susciperent odia, & execrabili haberentur in uonune? p. 33. sub in. ^s Quantum-

of their being called impious, irreligious, atheistical. But that is another thing, and relates only to their disowning the heathen deities, and abandoning their worship, together with all their rites and ceremonies.

2.) But his book begins with that popular heathen complaint and calumny against the Christians, that ^a they were the occasion of all the calamities that beset mankind. This complaint, taken up ^u long before, was continued a good while after this, and is finely answered by ^a our Arnobius, as well as by later ^y Christian writers. That absurd and ridiculous charge seems to have been the immediate occasion of Arnobius's resolving to write an apology for the Christians.

3.) Another objection against the Christians was, that ^z their religion was new. To which good answers may be seen in Arnobius, to ^a whom I refer.

4.) Another was, that ^b Christ came no sooner. To which Arnobius makes several ^c answers, and among the rest this: that there ^d may be good reasons, well known to God, though men be unacquainted with them; and that this is a sufficient answer.

5.) They objected: if ^e Christ came to save men, why are not all saved?

6.) They excepted ^f against Christ's birth as a man.

libet nos impios, irreligiosos vocetis, aut atheos, nunquam fidem facietis esse amorum deos, &c. l. iii. p. 116. f. Trophonius nos impios, Dodonæus aut Jupiter nominat, — l. i. p. 14. — ut convitio utamur vestro, insaulti & athei nuncupamur, ib. p. 16. ^u Quoniam comperi nonnullos,

qui se plurimum sapere suis persuasionibus credunt, insanire, bacchari, & velut quidam promptum ex oraculo dicere: postquam esse in mundo Christiana gens cepit, terrarum orbem perivisse, multiformibus malis affectum esse genus humanum: ipsos etiam cœlites derelictis curis solemnibus, quibus quondam solebant invlere res nostras, terrarum ab regionibus exterminatos: statui pro capto ac mediocritate sermonis contraire invidiæ, & calumniosas dissolvere criminationes; ne aut illi sibi videantur, popularia dum verba depromunt, magnum aliquid dicere; aut nos, &c. l. i. p. 1. ^u Vid.

Tertul. Ap. c. 40. ^x p. 2, 3, &c.

^y Vid. P. Oros. Hist. & August. Retr. l. ii. c. 43. ^z Religiones, inquit,

impias, atque inauditos cultus terrarum in orbem trahitis, l. i. p. 13. Neque quod nobis oblectare consuevit, novellam esse religionem nostram, & ante dies natam promodum paucos, neque vos potuisse anti-

quam & patriam relinquere, & in barbaros ritus peregrinosque reduci, ratione istud intenditur nulla, l. ii. p. 90. & passim.

^a Non ergo quod sequimur novum est, sed nos sero didicimus, &c. l. ii. p. 95, &c.

^b Et quid, inquit, est visum Deo regi atque principi, ut ante horas, quemadmodum dicitur, pauculas sospitator ad vos Christus cœli ex arcibus mitteretur? l. ii. p. 96.

^c Vid. p. 87, 90, 96, 97. ^d Quænam

igitur ratio est? Non imus inficias, nescire nos. Neque enim promptum est cuiquam Dei mentem videre, aut quibus modis ordinaverit res suas. Homo animal cæcum, & ipsum se nesciens, nullis potest rationibus consequi, quid oporteat fieri, quando, vel quo genere. Ipse rerum cunctarum pater, moderator, & dominus scit id solus, &c. p. 96, 97. ^e Sed si generis Christus humani, ut inquitis, conservator advenit,

quor omnino non omnes æquali munificentiâ liberat? l. ii. p. 88. ^f Sed non,

inquit, idcirco dii vobis infesti sunt, quod omnipotentem colatis Deum: sed quod hominem natum, & quod personis infame est vilibus crucis supplicio interentum, & Deum fuisse contenditis, & superesse adhuc creditis, &c. l. i. p. 19, 20. Natum hominum colitis, p. 24. iii. & passim.

7.) And we may be assured, they ^s did not fail to make exceptions to his death: the death too of criminals, and mean persons. Arnobius answers, that ^h neither his death, nor the manner of it, makes any alteration in his words, or his works, or any way weakens his authority. Besides, he ⁱ rose again from the dead in a short time. Nor ^k did his divinity die and suffer, but only his humanity.

4. Bull supposeth, that ^l Arnobius asserts the true divinity of the Son. But it seems to me, that this is far from being clear. Arnobius indeed calls Christ God, and true God: but I think he means no more, than that he is a God, and truly God. For he so distinguisheth Christ from God, the Lord and Sovereign of all, that I do not see how he could think him one God with the Father. For proof of this, I place at the bottom of the page ^m two of those passages, which Bull allegeth as most to his purpose. And I shall add ⁿ several others, where also Arnobius, in like manner as in those alleged by Bull, remarkably distinguishes Christ from the one God Almighty, from the Supreme King, the first and chief God. By true God he seems to mean no more than truly ^o so, in some sense, in opposition to such as are esteemed and called gods, but are not so at all, and have no right to that title.

^g Vid. not. (f).

^h Sed patibulo

affixus interiit. Quid illud ad causam? Neque enim qualitas & deformitas mortis dicta ejus immutat aut facta, aut eo minus videbitur disciplinarum ejus auctoritas, quia vinculis corporis non naturali dissolutione digressus est, sed vi illata discessit, l. i. p. 23. m.

ⁱ Unus fuit e nobis, qui deposito corpore innumeris se hominum promta in luce detexit? l. i. p. 27. in.

^k Sed more est hominis interemtus. Non ipse. Neque enim cadere divinas in res potest mortis occasus: nec interitionis dissolutione dilabi id, quod est unum ac simplex, nec ullarum partium congregatione compactum. Quis est ergo visus in patibulo pendere? quis mortuus est? Homo, quem induerat, & secum ipse portabat, l. i. p. 37 & 38.

^l In eo opere veram ille Filii divinitatem sepius atque apertissimis verbis constitetur. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 151. al. 168.

^m Ergone, inquiet aliquis furens, iratus, & percitus, Deus ille est Christus? Deus respondebimus, & intericrum potentiarum Deus: & quod magis infidus acerbissimis doloribus torqueat, rei maxime causa a summo Rege ad nos missus. Arnob. l. i. p. 24. Deus ille sublimis fuit, Deus radice ab intima, Deus ab incognitis

rebus, & ab omnium Principe Deus sol-

pitator est missus, ib. p. 32.

ⁿ — Omnipotens, & primus Deus — Nonne solus ingenuus, immortalis, & perpetuus solus est? l. ii. p. 95.

Potest ergo fieri, ut tum demum emiserit Christum Deus Omnipotens, Deus solus. — p. 97.

— propter quas in mundum venerat faciendas, Summi Regis imperio & dispositione servatis, l. i. p. 37. m.

— cum animas renuamus Dei esse Principis prolem, l. ii. p. 76.

— visum est Deo Regi atque principi, p. 96. m.

— unum solum posuisse contenti, nihil a Deo principe quod sit nocens — proficisci, p. 81.

— Deus inquam Christus — Dei principis jussione loquens sub hominis forma — p. 85. f.

— in Deo rerum capite, — Dei principis notioni. — p. 86.

— Nonne dignus a nobis est tantorum ob munerum gratiam Deus dici, Deusque sentiri? l. i. p. 21.

^o Cum enim Dii omnes, vel quicumque sunt veri, vel qui esse rumore atque opinione dicuntur, immortales & perpetui voluntate ejus sint, l. ii. p. 87.

Nor

Nor does Bull say; whether this author thought rightly of the Spirit. Indeed I am not certain, that Arnobius has once mentioned the Holy Ghost. However, I shall^p put in the margin a passage, to be considered by my readers.

I shall add here a few more select passages.

5. Beaufobre once had suspicions, that^a Arnobius held the Manichæan principle concerning the origin of the human soul; but upon farther consideration he acquitted him. I cannot believe, that Arnobius was at all acquainted with the Manichees. And Beaufobre's opinion, that Manichæism had spread in Africa before the end of the third century, appears to me to be without good foundation.

6. Arnobius seems to speak of some^t extraordinary works done in the name of Christ in his own time.

7. He supposeth Christ to have died, that^t thereby, and by his resurrection afterwards, he might confirm the truth of his doctrine, and give his followers full assurance of immortality.

8. In his answer to the forementioned objection, If Christ came to save men, why are not all saved? he strongly asserts human power and freedom. For he says, that^t the kind proposal of the gospel is made to all, if any refuse it, it is their own fault. It is not to be expected, that God should force their consent: it is not the method of his dealings with men.

9. Arnobius informs us, that^u not a few heathens of his time were much offended at Cicero, for the freedom he had

^p Ita unius pontificium Christi est, dare animis salutem, & spiritum perpetuitatis apponere, l. ii. p. 89. sub fin. And compare Beauf. Hist. de Manich. T. ii. p. 413.

^a See Beauf. Hist. de Manich. T. ii. p. 413, &c. See him likewise, p. 145, 146. and p. 330, 331. & 398, 399.

^t — qui iustissimis viris etiam nunc impollutis, ac diligentibus sese, non per vana insomnia, sed per puræ speciem simplicitatis apparet? cujus nomen auditum fugat noxios spiritus, imponit silentium vatibus, haruspices inconsultos reddit, arrogantium magorum frustrari efficit actiones, non horrore, ut dicitis, nominis, sed majoris licentia potestatis, l. i. p. 27.

^s Cumque novitas rerum, & inaudita premisso audientium turbaret mentes, & credulitatem faceret hæsitare, virtutum omnium dominus, atque ipsius mortis extinctor hominem suum permiserit interfici, ut ex rebus consequentibus scirent in tuto esse spes suas, quas jamdudum acceperant de animarum salute, nec periculum mortis alia se posse ratione vitare, l. i. p. 41.

^t Non æqualiter liberat, qui æqualiter omnes vocat? — Si tibi fastidium tantum est, ut oblatis rebus beneficium muneris — quid invitans in te peccat, cujus solæ sunt hæ partes, ut sub tui juris arbitrio fructum suæ benignitatis exponat? — Vis sumere quod offertur, atque in tuos usus convertere? Consulueris tu tibi — Nulli Deus infert necessitatem — Immo, inquit, si Deus est potens, misericors, conservator, convertat nobis mentes, & invitos faciat suis pollicitationibus credere. Vis ergo est ista, non gratia: nec Dei liberalitas principis, sed ad vincendi studium, puerillis atque animi contentio, l. ii. p. 88 & 89.

^u Adduci enim primum hoc ut credamus non possumus, immortalem illam — naturam divisam esse per sexus — Quem quidem locum plene jamdudum homines pectoris vivi, — explicavere — & ante omnes Tullius Romani disertissimus generis — Sed quid aucupia verborum, splendoremque sermonis peti ab hoc edicam, cum sciam esse non paucos, qui avertentur, refugiant, libros de hoc ejus, nec in aurem

taken in exposing some of their absurd sentiments concerning their deities; and that his writings were so serviceable to the Christian cause, that some people were for having his works, or some of them at least, destroyed, or prohibited by order of the senate.

10. Upon occasion of which, Arnobius declares it to be his opinion, that ^a reading and inquiry ought not to be discouraged, and that so doing is a sign of a bad cause.

Mr. Bayle observed this passage of our author: I choose to place his words at the bottom of the ^y page.

IV. I come now to observe this writer's testimony to the scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

1. Arnobius has not expressly quoted any books, either of the Old or the New Testament. It is likely, that he did not judge it proper to allege the scriptures, as books of authority, in an argument with heathens, and was of the same opinion upon this head with Lactantius, who ^z did not scruple to censure St. Cyprian for so doing.

2. We can perceive however, that Arnobius was acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures. For whereas ^a some heathens objected, that those scriptures spake of God, as having bodily parts, and human passions; he recommends it to them, to study the style of those books with greater care, and then, he says, they will better know their true meaning.

Nevertheless it must be owned, that at the end of his sixth book, and in the seventh book almost throughout, Arnobius ^b

velint admittere lectionem opinionum suarum præsumta vicentem? Cumque alios audiam multitare indignanter, & dicere: Oportere statui per Senatum, aboleantur ut hæc scripta, quibus religio Christiana comprobetur, & vetustatis opprimatur auctoritas. Quinimo si fiditis exploratum vos dicere quicquam de diis vestris, erroris convincite Ciceronem, temeraria & impia dictitantem refellitote, redarguite, comprobate. Nam interciperet scripta, & publicatam velle submovere lectionem, non est deos defendere, sed veritatis testificationem timere, l. iii. p. 103, 104. ^x Vid. not. u.

^y — il auroit pu se moquer de ces sectaires, s'ils fussent venus lui alleguer les reflexions que faisoit Arnobe, sur ce que les idolâtres demandoient que le sénat abolit par ses arrêts quelques livres de Ciceron, ou la vanité des faux dieux est démontrée. Refutez-les, leur disoit Arnobe, s'ils contiennent des impietez. Car d'en interdire la lecture, ce n'est pas soutenir la cause des dieux, c'est craindre le temoignage de la vérité. Bayle Dict. V. iv. p. 2840. b.

edit. 3. Volkelius, Note (A).

^z — qua materia non est usus, ut debuit. Non enim scripturæ testimoniis, quam ille [Demetrianus] utique vanam, fidam, commentitiamque putabat; sed argumentis, & ratione fuerat refellendus. Nam cum ageret contra hominem veritatis ignarum, dilatis paulisper divinis lectionibus, formare hunc a principio tanquam rudem debuit, atque paulatim lucis principia monstrare, Lact. Inst. l. v. c. 4. ^a Nunc ad speciem veniamus & formas, quibus esse descriptos deos superos creditis — Neque quisquam Judaicas in hoc loco nobis opponat, & sadducei generis fabulas, tanquam formas tribuant atque os Deo. Hoc enim putatur in eorum literis dici, & ut vel recerta, atque auctoritate firmari: quæ aut nihil ad nos attinent — aut si sunt, ut creditur, sociæ, querendi sunt nobis altioris intelligentiæ doctores, per quos possitis addiscere quibus modis conveniat literarum illarum nubes atque involucri relaxare, l. iii. p. 106, 107. ^b Ergone, o Jupiter, aut quis alius Deus es, humanum est istud

so argues against all manner of sacrifices, and particularly bloody sacrifices of animals; that we may be apt to suspect, he was not well acquainted with the Mosaic institution, or else had but little regard for it. And it is not unlikely, that about this time Gentile people became first acquainted with Christians and their scriptures: and they might be converted some while, before they were well acquainted with the Jewish scriptures, and the ancient constitution of that people.

3. Arnobius, for certain, was well acquainted with the books of the New Testament, though he did not think fit to quote them expressly in his books against the Gentiles.

4. He says, 'the world has this benefit from Christ, that there is already a vast multitude of men, who have been taught by his laws, precepts, and institutions, *not to return evil for evil*, and rather to suffer wrong than do any.

5. Herein he may be thought to refer to the whole tenor of the Christian doctrine, as contained in the New Testament. However it must be also reckoned probable, that he has some particular regard to that part of our Lord's doctrine, which is recorded in the fifth chapter of St. Matthew's gospel, especially from ver. 38 to the end; and perhaps to some other texts, where *recompensing*, or *rendering evil for evil*, is forbidden in terms, much resembling those of Arnobius. See Rom. xii. 17. 1 Theff. v. 15. 1 Pet. iii. 9.

6. He has enumerated the miracles of our Saviour in such a manner, as shews him to have been well acquainted with our gospels; and that he gave full credit to them, and paid them great deference. 'He^d speaks of our Lord's healing fevers,

& rectum,—& cum alius peccaverit, ego occidar, & de meo sanguine fieri tibi patiaris satis qui nunquam te laeserim? &c. l. vii. p. 216. — quod est istud honoris genus, vervecem, arietem, taurum, dei sub ore connectere, conspectuque in ejus occidere? Quod est honorum genus deum invitare ad sanguinem, quem cum canibus videas cum sumere, atque habere communem? ib. p. 222.

^c Nam cum hominum vis tanta magisteriis ejus acceperimus ac legibus, malum malo rependi non oportere; injuriam perpeti quam irrogare esse præstantius,—habet a Christo beneficium jamdudum orbis ingratius, l. i. p. 5, 6.

^d Ergo ille mortalis, aut unus fuit e nobis, cujus imperium, cujus vocem popularibus & quotidianis verbis missam, valetudines, morbi, febres, atque alia corporum cruciamenta fugiebant? Unus fuit e nobis, cujus præsentiam, cujus visum gens illa ne-

quibat ferre merforum in visceribus demonum, conterritaque vi nova membrorum possessione cedebat? Unus fuit e nobis, cujus sædæ vitilignes jussioni obtemperabant pulsæ statim, & concordiam colorum commaculatis visceribus relinquebant? Unus fuit e nobis, cujus ex levi tactu stabant profluvia sanguinis, & immoderatos cohibebant fluores? Unus fuit e nobis, cujus manus intercutēs & veterosæ fugiebant undæ —? Unus fuit e nobis, qui claudos currere præcipiebat? Etiam operis res erat porrigere mancos manus, & articuli immobilitates jam ingenitas explicabant: captos membris assurgere. Etiam suos referebant lectos alienis paulo ante cervicibus lati: viduatos videre luminibus, etiam cælum diemque nullis cum oculis procreatis. Unus, inquam, fuit e nobis, qui debilitatibus variis, morbisque vexatos centum, aut hoc amplius, semel una intercessione sanabat? cujus vo-

‘ dropsies, lunacies, leprogies, and all manner of diseases and
 ‘ torments, to which the human frame is subject; and relieving
 ‘ great numbers of those deplorable cases on the sudden, by
 ‘ his word and command only, without any external means,
 ‘ and without charms and incantations: and some obtained
 ‘ relief by only a slight touch of his garment. He strengthened
 ‘ the lame to walk, and to carry their beds, who before were
 ‘ carried themselves upon men’s shoulders: he enabled the
 ‘ deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak: he gave sight to the
 ‘ blind, to some that were blind from their birth: he calmed
 ‘ the boisterous winds, and the stormy seas, and himself walked
 ‘ safely upon them: he fed five thousand people at once with
 ‘ five loaves, of which also there remained, after all were satis-
 ‘ fied, such an abundance, that twelve baskets were filled with
 ‘ the fragments: a sure proof,’ he says, ‘ that there was no de-
 ‘ ceit: he raised the dead, and some that had been buried.’

7. He observes also, agreeably to our gospels, that ‘ some-
 times Christ by touching the afflicted with his hands, at other
 times by his sole command, opened the ears of the deaf, and
 the eyes of the blind, and unloosed the tongues of the dumb,
 or gave feet to the lame, and performed other like works.

8. He takes notice^f of the uncommon darkness, and other
 surprising events, at the time of our Lord’s passion and death;
 which he describes in a very rhetorical manner.

9. Arnobius, as before said, does not expressly quote any
 books of scripture: but it is likely, that he, in the places just
 cited, refers to our evangelists, and their histories. It is plain,
 he does not take his accounts of our Lord’s miracles from oral
 tradition only. For, as he goes along in his argument, he re-
 fers to^g writers, and^h writings, which also he calls ours.

cem ad simplicem furibunda & insana ex-
 plicabant se maria, procellarum turbines
 tempestatesque sidebant? qui per altissimos
 gurgites pedem ferebat inlutum? calcabat
 ponti terga undis ipsis stupeantibus, in sa-
 mulatum subeunte natura? qui sequentium
 se millia quinque, quinque saturavit e pa-
 nibus, ac ne esse præstigiæ incredulis illis
 viderentur & duris, his senarum sportarum
 fragminibus aggerebat? Unus fuit e nobis,
 qui redire in corpora jamdudum animas
 præcipiebat afflatis, prodire ab aggeribus
 conditos? & post diem funeris tertium pol-
 linctorum voluminibus expediri? l. i. p. 26.

^e Christus enim scitur, aut admota par-
 tibus debilitatis manu, aut vocis simplicis
 jussione, aures aperuisse surdorum, extur-

basse ab oculis cæcitates, orationem dedisse
 mutis, articulorum vincula relaxasse, am-
 bulatum dedisse contractis, &c. ib. p. 28.

^f Exutus at corpore, quod in exigua sui
 circumferebat parte, postquam videri se
 passus est, cujus esset aut magnitudinis sciri,
 novitate rerum exterrita universa mundi
 sunt elementa turbata, tellus mota contrem-
 uit, mare funditus refusum est, aër globis
 involutus est tenebrarum, igneus orbis solis
 tepescendo ardore dirigit, p. 32.

^g Conscriptores nostri, l. i. p. 33. Quic-
 quid dicere de nostris conscriptoribus inten-
 deritis, p. 34.

^h Non creditis scrip-
 tis nostris? p. 34. — quæ in nostris con-
 signata sunt literis, consiteamini necesse est
 esse vera, ib.

10. We may be confirmed in the supposition, that he means our evangelists, and their gospels, from the character he gives the historians of our Lord's miracles, which he speaks of. For ¹ he insists, that they are credible witnesses of the things they relate, because they had seen them, and were present at the doing them; and they write with evident marks of truth and credibility. He likewise owns, that ² they were unlearned and mean men, and that their style is destitute of ornaments. But then he says, that their accounts are not for those reasons the less credible.

11. He seems to refer ¹ to John xiv. 6. and perhaps to some other texts in that gospel.

12. He seems likewise to refer to the book of the Acts of the Apostles, when he says, that ^m Christ gave to those little ones, fishermen, and other mean persons, his disciples, the power of performing the same great works that he did: and ⁿ when he speaks of their exerting that power all over the world, in obedience to the commission they had received. And he may be thought to refer to the great miracle of speaking with divers tongues, recorded Acts ii. when he expresseth himself after this manner: 'Was ^o he one of us, who, when he spake one ^c language, was thought by divers people, using different languages, to speak words they were well acquainted with, and ^c in their own language?' He may be thought likewise to allude to ^p Acts xvii. 25 and 28.

13. In the accounts he gives ^q of our Lord's resurrection, and the many proofs and incontestible evidences, which were

ⁱ Sed non creditis gesta hæc. Sed qui ea conspicati sunt fieri, & sub oculis suis viderunt agi, testes optimi, certissimi que auctores, & crediderunt hæc ipsi, & credenda posteris nobis, haud exilibus cum approbationibus tradiderunt, p. 32. f. Vid. & p. 33.

^k Sed ab indoctis hominibus, & rudibus, scripta sunt, & idcirco non sent facili auditione credenda. Vide ne magis hæc fortior causa sit, cur illa nullis coinquinata mendaciis, mente simplici tradita, & ignara lenociniis ampliari. Trivialis & sordidus sermo est. Nunquam enim veritas sectata est fucum, nec quod exploratum & certum est, circumduci se patitur per ambitum longiorem, l. i. p. 34. 35.

^l Et hoc necesse a nobis est, ut debeatis accipere, a nullo animas posse vim vitæ atque incolumitatis accipere, nisi ab eo, quem rex summus huic muneri officioque præfecit. Hanc Omnipotens Imperator esse voluit salutis viam, hanc vitæ,

ut ita dixerim, januam. Per hunc solum est ingressus ad lucem, &c. l. ii. p. 89, 90.

^m Neque quicquam est ab illo gestum per admirationem stupentibus cunctis, quod non omne donaverit faciendum parvulis istis & rusticis, & eorum subjecerit potestati, l. i. p. 30. f.

ⁿ Imo quia hæc omnia & ab ipso cernebant geri, & ab ejus præconibus, qui per orbem totum missi beneficia patris & munera sanandis animis hominibusque portabant, &c. l. i. p. 33. m.

^o Unus fuit e nobis, qui cum unam emitteret vocem, ab diversis populis, & dissona oratione loquentibus, familiaribus verborum sonis, & suo cuique utens existimabatur eloquio? p. 27.

^p Nonne huic omnes debemus, hoc ipsum primum, quod sumus? — Non quod incedimus, quod spiramus & vivimus, ab eo ad nos venit, vique ipsa vivendi efficit nos esse, ut animam agitatione motari? l. i. p. 16.

^q Unus est e nobis, qui deposito corpore incedimus, &c.

afforded of it, it is somewhat doubtful, whether he refers only to the histories of that important event at the end of the gospels, or whether he intends likewise the beginning of the book of the Acts.

14. He has the words of ¹ 1 Cor. iii. 19. but without any intimation of his borrowing from any particular book.

15. St. Paul says, 1 Cor. xv. 6. that our Lord, after he was risen, *was seen of above five hundred brethren at once.* It is not easy to say, whether Arnobius has any particular reference to that text, when he observes, that ² Christ in a short time after he had died, shewed himself to innumerable people.

16. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks much of Christ's priesthood: Arnobius also has the expression of Christ's high-priesthood. In Heb. ix. 6. are the words *eternal spirit*: Arnobius has a like expression. I refer to a passage, which ³ may be consulted for both these particulars. But I somewhat question, whether any will think our author had an eye to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

17. It may be proper to observe here, that ⁴ in one place Arnobius speaks of the burning of the Christian scriptures, and complains of it, as a most unreasonable thing.

18. This is all which we have to produce from this writer upon this head. We have seen good evidence of his being well acquainted with the gospels. And it is likely, that he had read, and highly respected the other books of the New Testament, generally received by Christians. But he did not judge it proper to quote expressly, and as of authority, any books of scripture, in an argument with heathens.

V. I shall now, as formerly proposed, make some extracts out of the other Arnobius's Commentaries upon the Psalms. But a few particulars will suffice out of so late a writer, who flourished not till about the year 460. I shall take it for granted, that he received the Old Testament, and those books of the New, which were always received by all Christians in general. I shall only observe some passages, relating to such books, or parts of books of the New Testament, which have been denied, or disputed by some, together with a few other remarkable things.

hominum promta in luce detexit? qui sermonem dedit, atque accepit, docuit, castigavit, admonuit? qui ne illi se falsos vanis imaginationibus exultarent, semel, iterum, sapius familiari colloquutione monstravit, l. i. p. 37. ⁵ Nunquam illud vulgatum peritruinxit aures vestras, sapientiam homi-

nis stultitiam esse apud Deum? l. ii. p. 46. in. ⁶ See before Note (9).

⁷ That passage is quoted already, p. 17. Note (7). ⁸ Nam nostra quidem scripta cur ignibus merverunt dari? cur immaniter conventicula dirui? l. iv. p. 152. f.

1. There

1. There are in these Commentaries some indications, that^a there still were heathens, who practised their idolatrous rites and ceremonies.

2. He magnifies the speedy progress of the gospel in this manner: 'For^b many ages God was known in Judea only. 'But upon the coming of Christ, the word of the Lord ran swiftly from the east to the west, from the Indies to Britain.

3. This writer mentions divers of those Christians, which are called heretics, as^c the Novatians, the^d Manichees, and^e Photinus, and^f some others.

4. This author cites^g our Lord's genealogy in the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel.

5. He takes notice of several things in the second chapter of the same gospel, as^h the coming of the wise men to Jerusalem, the star that conducted them, and the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem.

6. He also mentions several things, which are inⁱ the first and second chapters of St. Luke's gospel.

7. He has several things out of the book of^k the Acts.

8. He has twice quoted Philip. ii. 6. and in one of those places seems to understand^l the words rendered by us, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, as expressing our Lord's free and voluntary humiliation.

9. He received^m the epistle to the Hebrews, as St. Paul's.

^a Usque hodie gentes fremunt adversus Christum, qui idolis finem imposuit. Arnob. in Pf. ii. p. 3. Basil. 1560. In Libano sacrificantes usque hodie turpissimæ Veneri, vitulorum virilia amputant, & in ejus sacrificio hujusmodi incensa supponunt, mercedem quam oportuit erroris sui, deæ suæ exhibent meretrici. In Pf. xxviii. p. 64. Vid. & in Pf. ix. p. 17.

^b Et tam velociter currit sermo ejus, ut cum per tot millia annorum in sola Judæa notus fuerit Deus, nunc intra paucos annos, nec ipsos Indos lateat a parte Orientis, nec ipsos Britones a parte occidentis, ubique cucurrit velociter sermo ejus. In Pf. cxlvii. p. 443. Sicut enim ecclesiæ in toto mundo politæ civitates sanctorum sunt. In Pf. ix. p. 17.

^c In Pf. cv. p. 195. in Pf. cxxxviii. p. 406 & 407.

^d In Pf. cx. p. 319. in Pf. cxxxviii. p. 409. ^e Non ergo sicut damnabilis Photinus credit, ex Mariæ partu sumsit exordium, sed ante luciferum est ex patris ore progenitus. In Pf. cix. p. 317.

^f Hunc enim eundemque Deum Marcion negat, similiter Apelles & Valentinus & Manichæus, infideles & miseri. In Pf.

cxliiii. p. 430.

^g Sic enim legis evangelii caput: Liber generationis Jesu Christi, filii David, filii Abraham. In Pf. ciii. p. 277.

^h Sic autem proprium locum relinquentes magi stellæ indicio, &c. in Pf. xviii. al. xix. p. 40. Herodes turbatur, pastores terrentur, magi fugiunt, infantes occiduntur, angeli psallunt dicentes: Gloria Deo in excelsis, &c. In Pf. xlvi. p. 118. Vid. & in Pf. xlvii. p. 120.

ⁱ In Pf. xviii. al. xix. p. 41. in Pf. lxxi. p. 185. Vid. & supr. not. (b).

^k Hi autem, qui cum apostolis tertia diei hora ebrii sunt Spiritu Sancto, lætentur, &c. In Prologo. p. 1. — ita ut universarum gentium loquaces dicerent de eis: Nonne hi viri Galilæi sunt, &c. in Pf. xviii. al. xix. p. 41. Unde & Petrus mendicanti infirmo: Argentum & aurum non habeo, &c. In Pf. lxviii. p. 178.

^l Ille, cum dominus cœli & terræ esset, non rapinam arbitratus est esse se æqualem Deo, sed semet ipsum exinanivit, &c. In Pf. cxxx. p. 383. Cum in forma dei esset, essetque æqualis Deo Patri, exinanivit seipsum, &c. In Pf. cxliiii. p. 429.

^m Sine fide autem,

10. He quotes ^a the epistle of James, as written by James the apostle.

11. He quotes ^o the book of the Revelation, and ascribes it to John the apostle.

12. He recommends ^p the frequent reading of the scriptures.

C H A P. LXV.

L A C T A N T I U S.

I. *His history.* II. *His Works.* III. *Select passages:* 1. *The design of the Christian religion.* 2. *Its effects.* 3. *His interpretation of Gen. vi. 3.* 4. *Free will.* 5. *Christian writers mentioned by him.* 6, 7. *Writers against the Christian religion.* 8. *Unsteady Christians in his time.* 9. *Calumnies against the Christians.* 10. *The innocence of Christian people.* 11. *Miracles in his time.* 12. *A future state proveable by reason.* 13. *He did not deny the eternity of hell-torments.* 14. *The value of repentance.* 15. *The ends of Christ's coming and death.* 16. *The great progress of the Christian religion.* 17. *Christian fortitude.* 18. *The right of private judgment.* 19. *Arguments against persecution.* 20. *Christians did not persecute.* IV. *Errors ascribed to him:* 1. *Manichæism.* 2. *He denied antipodes.* 3. *Of the fall of angels.* 4. *Held a millennium.* 5. *Denied the personality of the Spirit.* 6. *Of the origin of the soul.* 7. *Of Christ's priestly office.* V. *His character.* VI. *His testimony to the scriptures:* 1. *Of the Old Testament.* 2. *Of the New Testament, particularly the gospels.* 3. *The Acts of the Apostles.* 4. *St. Paul's epistles.* 5. *The catholic epistles.* 6. *The Revelation.* 7. *Respect for the scriptures.* VII. *Whether he quotes any other writings as of authority.* VIII. *The sum of his testimony to the scriptures.* IX. *Extracts from the book of the deaths of persecutors.*

ST. JEROM'S history of Lactantius in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, is to this purpose: 'Firmianus^a, called

ut ait Apostolus, impossibile est placere Deo. In Ps. lxxvii. p. 207. Ad hæc Paulus clamat, Hebraus ex Hebrais, Impossibile est mentiri Deum, [Hebr. vi. 18.] In Ps. civ. p. 287. ^a Unde & Jacobus apostolus: Omnes, inquit, gaudium existimate fratres cum in tentationibus variis incideritis. [Cap. i. 2.] In Ps. xxvii. p. 73 & 74. ^o Sicut Ezechielis prophetia, & Joannis Apocalypsis loquitur. In Ps. xx. p. 45. Si vis videre divitem & mendicum, sancti apostoli Joannis lege Apoca-

lypsin. In Ps. cii. p. 274. ^p Deus enim sciri vult omnia suarum mysteria literarum — Beatus enim perfectus esse non poteris, nisi scrutatus fueris testimonia ejus, — Tu, quid facis, Christiane? Si militas homini, scrutaris legem ejus; quia si quid licet jam ignarus incurreris, moneris. Nescire enim legem nemini licet. — Servus Christi es? Scrutare testimonia ejus. In Ps. cxviii. al. cxix. p. 338, 339.

^a Firmianus, qui & Lactantius, Arnobii discipulus sub Diocletiano principe accitus

'also

also Lactantius, scholar of Arnobius, being sent for in the time of the emperor Dioclesian, together with Flavius Grammaticus, whose books of medicines, written in verse, are still extant, taught rhetoric at Nicomedia: but not having many scholars there, it being a Greek city, he betook himself to writing. We have his Banquet, which he wrote when very young: an Itinerary from Africa to Nicomedia, in (A) hexameter verses: and another book, entitled Grammaticus: and an excellent book Of the Wrath of God; and seven books of Divine Institutions against the Gentiles: and an Epitome of the same work in one book, the beginning of which is wanting: and two books to Asclepiades: of the Persecution, one book: four books of Epistles to Probus: two books of Epistles to Severus: two books of Epistles to Demetrian, his scholar: and to the same, one book of the Workmanship of God, or the Formation of Man. In his old age he was preceptor to Crispus Cæsar, son of Constantine, in Gaul, who was afterwards put to death by his father.

Eusebius in his Chronicle, or rather Jerom, (who^b in his translation of that work of Eusebius, inserted divers things of his own, especially relating to the Roman history and Latin authors,) says, 'That Crispus was instructed in Latin by Lactantius, the most learned man of his time, but so poor in this world, that for the most part he wanted necessaries.'

Cave says, that^d Lactantius flourished chiefly in the year 303, and onwards; which is not much amiss: for though Lactan-

cum Flavio Grammatico cujus de Medicinalibus versu compositi extant libri, Nicomediæ rhetoricam docuit, & penuria discipulorum, ob Græcam videlicet civitatem, ad scribendum se contulit. Habemus ejus Symposium, quod adolescentulus scripsit; Odisporicum de Africa usque ad Nicomediam, hexametris scriptura versibus; & alium librum, qui inscribitur Grammaticus; & pulcherrimum de Ira Dei; & Institutionum Divinarum adversum Gentiles libros septem; & Et Itinerarium ejusdem operis in libro uno acephalo; & ad Asclepiadem libros duos; de Persecutione librum unum; ad Probum Epistolarum libros quatuor; ad Severum Epistolarum libros duos; ad Demetrianum, auditorem suum, Epistolarum libros duos; ad eundem de Opificio Dei, vel Formatione hominis, librum unum. Hic extrema senectute magister Cæsaris Crispi, filii Constantini, in Gallia fuit, qui postea a patre interfestus. De Vir. Ill. cap. 80. (A) I shall here

place an ingenious conjecture of Dr. Heumann: Scilicet apud Hieronymum pro hexametris scriptum versibus conieci bam scriptum fuisse hexametris utrumque versibus: Utrumque, id est, tum Symposium, tum Odisporicum Lactantii. Vid. Sympof. Lact. in Præf. n. xix.

^b Sciendum etenim, me esse & interpretis & scriptoris ex parte officio usum, quia & Græca fidelissime expressi, & nonnulla, quæ intermissa videbantur, adjeci, in Romana maxime historia, quam Eusebius hujus conditor libri non tam ignorasse, ut pote eruditissimus, quam Græce scribens parum suis necessariam perstrinxisse mihi videtur. Hier. Præf. in Chr. p. 4. f.

^c Quorum Crispum Lactantius Latinis literis erudit, vir omnium suo tempore eruditissimus, sed adeo in hac vita pauper, ut plerunque etiam necessariis indiguerit. Chron. p. 180. f.

^d — claruit præcipue ann. 303. & deinceps. H. L. T. i. p. 161.

tius

tius lived partly in the third, and partly in the fourth century of the Christian æra, and must have been a man of note for polite literature before the year 300; yet it is likely, that most of his remaining pieces, particularly the *Divine Institutions*, his principal work, were not written till after the year 303.

This author's name is now generally written *Lucius Cælius*, or *Cæcilius Firmianus Lactantius*. But whether the names *Lucius* and *Cælius*, or *Cæcilius*, belong to him, may be questioned; they not being given him by any of the ancient writers who lived near his time: and they are generally wanting in the manuscript copies of his works, and ^e in the most early printed editions. In this manner divers learned men ^f argue upon this point: whilst some others contend, that ^g his name is rightly written as above.

The native country of *Lactantius* is not certainly known. Some have conjectured, that ^h he was born at *Firmum*, now *Fermo*, in Italy, and that from thence he was called *Firmianus*. But it is more generally reckoned, that ⁱ he was an African: his education under *Arnobius*, who taught rhetoric at *Sicca* in Africa, is an argument of some weight: and it is confirmed by the *Itinerary* of *Lactantius* from Africa to *Nicomedia*, which, probably, contained a description of his own journey from Africa to *Nicomedia*, when he was sent for by *Dioclesian*.

The original of the names ^k *Firmianus* and ^l *Lactantius*, has been largely considered by *Dr. Heumann*, to whom I refer.

^e Vid. Montf. *Diar. Ital.* p. 256.

^f Vid. Chr. M. Pfaff. *Diff. Prælim ad Epit. Inst. Div. Sect.* 12 & 13.

^g Vid. Heuman. *Pr. ad Lact. Symp. sect.* 16. p. xxviii. & *sect.* 22. p. xxxv. ^h Patriam habuit Italianam, forsitan *Firmio*, quod agri *Piceni* oppidum est ad oram maris *Hadriatici* oriundus, Cav. ubi supra, p. 161. *Firmianus* cognominatur a *Firmo*, agri *Piceni* oppido. Cellar. *Excerpt. de Vit. Lact.*

ⁱ Vid. Baluz. *Annot. ad Lact. de M. P. Tillem. Mem. Ec. Lactance*, T. 6. P. i. p. 340. & note 1. Vid. & Heuman. *Pr. ad Symp. sect.* 18 & 19. p. xxix—xxx.

^k Ceterum vulgata est opinio, *Lactantium*, cognomen *Firmiani* accepisse a patria *Firmo*, agri *Piceni* oppido. Sed hic quidem error facile confutatur. Primum enim ostendemus inferius, *Firmianum* fuisse proprium *Lactantii* nomen, neque adeo a patria inditum. Heum. *ib. sect.* 18. p. xxx.—Unde igitur, inquires, *Firmiani* nomen? Fuisse hoc proprium virorum nomen, illo

ævo non infrequens, facile sibi persuadebit, qui consideravit, plura veteribus nomina fuisse propria a *firmo* deducta. Non enim solum ipsum nomen *Firmus* factum est nomen proprium, sed etiam *Firmius*, *Firmicus*, *Firminus*, *Firmilianus*, *Firmianus*, &c. *Id. ib. sect.* 20. p. xxxii.

^l Superest *Lactantii* nomen, quod communiter creditur ei inditum fuisse a *lacte*o flumine eloquentiæ. Sed & hæc sententia, & simul altera illa de patria ejus *Firmo*, satis refellitur silentio *Hieronymi*. Is enim cum in catalogo suo, tum alibi, ubi *Lactantii* mentionem facit, perspicue ostendit, utrumque nomen, & *Lactantii* & *Firmiani*, ipsius fuisse proprium: ut multum errent, qui ea pro cognominibus habent a patria & eloquentia impositis — Quomodo enim a *lactans* derivatum est nomen *Lactantii*, sic a *prudens*, *vincens*, *constans*, — habemus nomina vulgo nota *Prudentii*, *Vicentii*, *Constantii*, *Fulgentii*, *Innocentii*, *Vigilantii*. *Id. ib. sect.* 21. p. xxxiii.

A good part of the history of our author, before taken from Jerom, may be confirmed from himself. For he speaks of ^m his being invited to Nicomedia, and of his teaching rhetoric there, when the church of the Christians in that city was destroyed, at the beginning of the persecution. He also intimates ⁿ his having been long employed as a professor of rhetoric, and his great diligence in the pursuit of eloquence: which he did not repent of, because he hoped it might be of use in the defence of true religion.

In his later works he refers to the more early. In his Divine Institutions he refers to ^o the Workmanship of God, inscribed to his scholar Demetrian, and written not long before. In his book of the Wrath of God, he several times makes mention of ^p the Divine Institutions. I need not add, that these last are also taken notice of in the Epitome, or abridgment of them. And whereas Jerom, among the works of Lactantius, reckons two books to Asclepiades, we find ^q Asclepiades mentioned by Lactantius in his Institutions. And we perceive, that Asclepiades had dedicated to him a book, which he commends. In his Institutions Lactantius also declares his intention ^r to write a distinct treatise upon the subject, Of the Wrath of God: which he afterwards did, as has been seen.

He also seems ^s to intimate his poverty, unless the words are capable of another sense, and mean only his many employments, by which he was fully engaged; or rather the difficulties of the time in which he lived, by reason of the persecution of cruel tyrants, as ^t Nourry understands the expression.

That extreme poverty of our author, which St. Jerom mentions, if Lactantius does not, may be thought to be a reflexion upon Constantine, that he should have made no better provision for his eldest son's preceptor. But Du Pin and Tille-

^m Ego cum in Bithynia oratorias literas accitus docerem, contigissetque, ut eodem tempore Dei templum everteretur. Inst. l. v. c. 2. sub in.

ⁿ Multum tamen exercitatio illa sistorum litium contulit, ut nunc majori copia & facultate dicendi causam veritatis peroremus. Ib. l. i. c. 1. p. 5.

^o — quam [materiam] ego nunc iccirco prætereo, quia nuper proprium de ea librum ad Demetriadem auditorem meum scripsi. Inst. l. ii. c. 10. p. 199.

^p Sed imperitiam horum jam coarguimus in secundo Divinarum Institutionum libro. De Ira Dei cap. 2. p. 766. Vid. ib. p. 767. & cap. 11. p. 793. & cap. 17. p. 809.

^q Optime igitur Asclepiades noster de Providentia summi Dei differens in eo libro, quem scripsit ad me. Inst. l. vii. c. 4. p. 660.

^r Seponatur interim locus hic nobis de ira Dei differendi: quod & uberius est materia, & opere proprio latius exsequenda. Inst. l. ii. c. 17. sub fin.

^s Quam minime sim quietus, etiam in summis necessitatibus, ex hoc libello poteris existimare. De Ira Dei, cap. 1. in.

^t Summarum autem difficultatum nomine designare videtur horrendam tyrannorum crudelitatem, qua in Christianos incredibilem plane in modum sæviebant. Nourr. App. T. 2. p. 582. B.

mont are of opinion, that ^u it was a voluntary poverty. What Jerom therefore writes of that matter is to be esteemed a grand and magnificent commendation. 'A ^x man must be virtuous in a high degree, to live miserably at court, want necessities in the midst of abundance, and taste no pleasures in the company of such as wallow in them.'

But I see no proof, that Lactantius was destitute of necessities, whilst he was employed in teaching Crispus; though it happens, that Jerom has mentioned those two things together. And what he says is, that for the most part Lactantius was poor. Therefore he was not always so: there was a time, when he had enough, and perhaps abundance: and he might enjoy it too, with moderation. That time, we may suppose to have been, when he was in the service of Constantine; the rest of his life he lived in mean circumstances.

Jerom has informed us, that Lactantius had not many scholars, whilst he taught rhetoric at Nicomedia; for which cause he betook himself to writing, which likewise, is no very profitable employment.

When we observe from his works, that Lactantius was a great reader; and consider, that books in manuscript must have been very costly; we can easily conceive, how the furniture of his library might keep him low for the most part.

Lactantius then may be reckoned to have been poor, and sometimes almost destitute, until he was invited to Constantine's court. And since his pupil Crispus was put to death by his father, it is likely, he was not much taken notice of afterwards. This, if I mistake not, is agreeable to St. Jerom's account, that Lactantius plerumque, for the most part, the greatest part of his life, was so poor, as to want even necessities. But those expressions, in my opinion, give no countenance at all to the supposition of a chosen and voluntary poverty. Trithemius seems to have understood ^y the case, as I have represented it. And Nourry is clearly of opinion, that ^z what is said by Jerom of our author's poverty, does not relate to the time when he had Crispus under his care.

We are not acquainted with the circumstances of this writer's family. The Epitome is inscribed to his brother ^a Pen-

^u Du Pin. Bibl. T. i. p. 205, Tillem. Mem. T. 6. P. i. p. 345, 346.

^x Du Pin, as before. ^y Rhetoricam primum Nicomediæ, deinde Romæ, sub Diocletiano, ab eo vocatus gloriose docuit. Ubi cum penuria discipulorum ad paupertatem devenisset, ad extremum Cæ-

faris Crispi filii Constantini præceptor, jam senex, in Gallia factus est. Trithem. de ser. Ec. cap. 56.

^z Sed hanc paupertatem aliis haud dubie temporibus pallus est, quam cum Crispum, Constantini M. filium, discipulum habuit. Nourr. ib. p. 382. B.

^a — tamen horum tibi epitomen fieri, tadius:

radius: but in what sense Pentadius was his brother, does not clearly ^b appear. Nor do we know any thing more of the life of Lactantius, than the particulars already mentioned; his education under Arnobius, his teaching rhetoric at Nicomedia, (where he certainly was at the beginning of the persecution under Dioclesian: where likewise, or in it's neighbourhood, he ^c seems to have stayed some-while after that persecution was begun), his writing the books above-mentioned, his instructing Crispus in the Latin tongue in Gaul, his being generally poor, and living to a great age, and ^d that he never pleaded as an advocate at the bar. But we are not informed, how he passed through that long and dreadful persecution. Nor can the time of his leaving Nicomedia, or of his coming into Gaul, or of his death, be exactly determined at present. If indeed the book of the Deaths of Persecutors be his, it may be thought, as ^e is argued by Baluze, that Lactantius became acquainted with Constantine, and left Nicomedia about the year 314, and soon after came into Gaul by order of that emperor.

It has been supposed by some, that Lactantius was at first a heathen. Gallæus ^f speaks of this as a point not to be disputed: Tillemont ^g in a manner takes it for granted: and it was the opinion likewise of ^h Du Pin, that Lactantius was converted in his youth. But Cellarius ⁱ was in suspense about it. Du Pin refers to two passages ^k of our author's works; where, as he says, Lactantius seems to reckon himself with those, who having seen their error embraced the true religion. But those expressions appear to me ambiguous: and, as I apprehend, they rather relate to the state of mankind in general, than to that of Lactantius himself, or of any other particular person; he there speaking of the great design of the Christian religion in general, to deliver men from the errors and superstitions, in which they had been long involved. So Arnobius says: ' It

Pentadi frater, desideras. Lact. Ep. cap. 1.

^b Vid. ibid. Pfaff. Annot.

^c Vidi ego in Bithynia præsidem gaudio mirabiliter elatum, — quod unus, qui per biennium magna virtute resisterat, postremo cedere visus esset, l. v. c. 11. p. 491. ^d Equidem tametsi operam dederim, ut quantulumcunque dicendi assequeretur facultatem propter studium docendi: tamen eloquens nunquam fui, quippe qui forum ne attigerim quidem. Inst. l. iii. c. 13. p. 275.

^e Vid. Baluz. Annot. ad libr. de M. P. p. 5. edit. Ultraj.

^f Gall. de Vit. Lact. ^g Tillem. as before, p. 34.

^h Du Pin, as before, p. 295.

ⁱ Primum ingenii monimentum, Symposium, in Africa adolescens edi-

dit: utrum tum Christianus, non omnino certum est. Cellar. Excerpt. de Vit. Lact.

^k Superest, ut exhortemur omnes, — ut contemtis terrestribus, & abjectis erroribus, quibus antea tenebamur — ad cælestis thesauri præmia dirigamur — Div. Inst. l. vii. cap. ult. p. 730. In hoc statu cum essent humanæ res, misertus est nostri Deus — revelavit se nobis, — ut errore prioris vitæ abjecto, — legem divinam tradente ipso Domino sumeremus; qua lege universi, quibus irretiti fuimus errores, cum vanis & impiis superstitionibus tollerentur. Epit. cap. iii. p. 739. Leyd. cap. lx. p. 129. ed. Pfaff.

'¹ is now about three hundred years, since we began to be Christians.'

Beside these two passages, Gallæus refers to^m a third. But the same answer will suffice for that likewise.

His being sent for by Dioclesian, to teach rhetoric at Nicomedia, is no proof that he was then a heathen. Dioclesian, whoⁿ was intent upon adorning that city, would be glad of any man of fine parts, who would come and take up his residence, and display them there. It is well known, that before the persecution there^o were many Christians in the imperial court and armies: and it is past doubt, that Lactantius was a Christian, when the persecution began at Nicomedia. Nor does his great and long diligence in the pursuit of eloquence, and the study of polite literature, afford any argument for his heathenism at that time. It can hardly be suspected, that Lactantius was not a Christian when he wrote the Epistles, mentioned by St. Jerom. Yet pope Damasius writes to him, that^p he did not read them with pleasure, because, though many of them were very long, they had little about the Christian doctrine, but chiefly related to measures, and the situation of countries, and philosophical questions. Nay, that observation of Damasius does at once afford a proof of our author's Christianity at that time, and of his extensive learning. Nor does the Symposium, supposing it to be a genuine work of Lactantius, demonstrate his heathenism. It was composed indeed during^q the holidays of Saturn. But yet there is no heathenism in any part of the work, as is^r well observed by the learned editor. Finally therefore, since^s there are no clear

¹ Trecenti sunt anni, minus vel plus aliquid, ex quo cepimus esse Christiani, & terrarum in orbe censi. Arnob. l. i. p. 9. in.

^m — cognoscere ministrum ejus, ac nuntium quem legavit in terram; quo dicente liberati ab errore, quo implicati tenebamur formatique ad veri Dei cultum, justitiam disceremus. De Ira Dei, Cap. 2. p. 766.

ⁿ Ita semper dementabat, Nicomediam studens urbi Romæ coequare. De M. Perf. cap. 7. ^o Vid. Euf. H. E. l. viii. cap. 6. & libr. de M. P. cap. 15.

^p Fateor quippe tibi, eos quos mihi jam pridem Lactantii dederas libros, ideo non libenter lego: quia & plurimæ epistolæ ejus usque ad mille spatia versuum tenduntur, & raro de nostro dogmate disputant: quo fit, ut & legenti fastidium generet longitudo: & si qua breviter sunt, scholasticis magis sint apta, quam nobis, de metris & regionum situ, & philosophis disputantibus,

[aliter disputantia]. Damas. Pap. ad Hier. T. ii. p. 561. Ed. Bened.

^q Hoc quoque Symposium lusi de carmine inepto.

Sic me Sicca docet, Sicca deliro magistra.

Annua Saturni dum tempora festa redirent.

Symp. Prolog.

^r — Nec enim quicquam in ejus æigmatibus inest, quod sapiat ethnicismum. Tantum abest, ut probet ethnicismum. Heuman Præf. ad Lact. Symp. Sect. 14. p. xxv.

^s Nam si Lactantius ex ethnicis tenebris ad lucem Christianæ sapientiæ emerisset, videtur summum hoc Numinis beneficium alicubi librorum suorum commemoraturus fuisse prædicaturusque — pristinæ religionis si diversam a Christianis prius habuisset, memoriam, tot invitantibus occasionibus, nec debuit suppressere, nec

intimations of his heathenism, or of his conversion to Christianity, in his own works, nor in any ancient writers who have mentioned him; I rather think, (though without being positive,) that he was from the beginning educated in the Christian religion. Nourry^c was of the same opinion: and herein I thought I had the honour to agree likewise with Dr. Heumann, who has^u lately given us a very valuable edition of Lactantius, and had been^x long before acquainted with his works. But in his preface^y to that edition, he has let fall some expressions on the other side; as if he had altered his opinion, or forgot what he had well and largely argued^z formerly.

II. We have seen in Jerom a catalogue of the works of Lactantius: the catalogues in Honorius of Autun and Trithemius are very little different.

1. The last-mentioned writer adds, that^a beside the books enumerated by him, it was said, that Lactantius had written not a few more, but he had not seen them.

2. Lactantius himself in his^b Institutions, and in^c his book Of the Wrath of God, mentions a design to write against all heresies; which we do not know that he ever did, being perhaps prevented by death. I thought it proper, however, to take notice of it in this place, as a proof of our author's zeal for truth, with which he was greatly enamoured, (as some other expressions also of his elsewhere^d shew,) and his readiness to employ his time in the defence of it.

3. And at the beginning of the seventh book of his Institutions, he promises somewhat^e against the Jews, which we have not, unless it be in the latter part of that very book.

4. Two of the three books first mentioned by Jerom, the Itinerary and Grammaticus, seem to be irrecoverably lost. And it has been generally thought, that the third, the Symposium, or Banquet, was lost likewise. But Dr. Heumann,

quæ pietas ejus fuit, voluit. Heuman. ib. p. xxiv. & xxv.

^c Nourr. Diss. in Lact. cap. i. p. 578.

^u Gottinge MDCCLXXVI. ^x The Symposium of Lactantius, with a long preface, was published by Dr. Heuman at HANOVER, in the year 1722.

^y Cum enim nec philosophus esset, nec diu sacris versatus in literis, (a puero enim sacra coluerat illa cum suis parentibus quæ postea exsecratur, illata menti suæ luce divinæ sapientiæ:) ne satis quidem perceperat ecclesiæ doctrinas, &c. Heuman. Præf. ad opp. Lactant. p. ante f. quart.

^z Several of his passages are alleged above at note (r) and (s).

^a Alia insuper non pauca scripsisse dici-

tur. Sed in manus nostras non venerunt. Trithem. cap. 56.

^b Postea plenius & uberius contra omnes mendaciorum sectas proprio separatoque opere pugnabimus. Inst. l. iv. c. ult. in fin.

^c — & refutabimus postea diligentius, cum respondere ad omnes sectas coeperimus, quæ veritatem, dum disputant, perdiderunt. De Ira Dei, c. 2. p. 767.

^d Nullus enim suavior animo cibus est, quam cognitio veritatis, cujus asserendæ, atque illustrandæ septem volumina destinavimus, l. i. c. 1. p. 9.

^e Sed erit nobis contra Judæos separata materia, in qua illos erroris & sceleris revincemus. Inst. l. vii. c. 1. ad fin.

who

who not very long since published an edition of a work with that title, asserts its genuineness. It is a collection of a hundred tristic epigrams, with a prologue. I do not dispute the favourable judgment, which the learned editor forms of this work. But I shall have no occasion to quote it at present.

5. All our author's book of Epistles are entirely lost. Pope Damasus, as ^a before shewn, did not read them with pleasure; and seems to have set but little value upon them: nevertheless some learned moderns ^b regret the loss of them.

According to the passage before cited from Jerom's Catalogue, there were only two books of Epistles to Demetrian. Nevertheless, in ^c another place Jerom quotes the eighth book of Lactantius's Epistles to Demetrian. I fancy the reason is this; there were in all eight books of Epistles, and those to Demetrian were placed last in the collection. Quoting therefore the second book to Demetrian, he calls it the eighth to him; meaning however no more, than the eighth book of this writer's epistles, which book was to Demetrian.

6. We still have the treatise Of the Workmanship of God, addressed to Demetrian, whom ^d he had taught rhetoric. Demetrian ^e seems to have been a man of fortune, and to have had then some public employment. Lactantius commends him: but he likewise admonisheth him to ^f be upon his guard against the snares of his prosperous condition. And yet it must have been a time of persecution. For with regard to himself, he speaks of the difficulty both of his own ^g circumstances, and of the times: and he says, that ^h the devil then acted as a roaring lion. Tillemont thinks, that ⁱ this was the first of our author's public labours in the service of religion, because he here expresseth a resolution to employ his time for the future in the defence of truth. But that argument is but barely pro-

^f See p. 30.

^g Utinam eas epistolas tempus rerum edax nobis non invidisset. Nos libenter legeremus. Basn. Ann. 320. n. iv.

^h — quod & Firmianus in octavo ad Demetrianum epistolarum libro facit. In Galat. c. iv. p. 268.

ⁱ Nam si te in literis nihil aliud quam linguam instruendis auditorum satis strenuum præbuisse: quanto magis in his veris, & ad vitam pertinentibus, docilior esse debbis? De Op. Dei, c. i. p. 829.

^k Nam licet te publicæ rei necessitas a veris & justis operibus avertat: tamen fieri non potest, quin subinde in cælum aspiciat mens tibi conscia recti, ibid.

^l Ego

quidem lætor, omnia tibi, quæ pro bonis habentur, prospere fluere: vereor enim, — Ideoque te moneo, repetens iterumque monebo, ne oblectamenta ista terræ pro magnis aut veris bonis habere te credas, ibid.

^m Apud quem nunc profiteor, nulla me necessitate vel rei, vel temporis impediri, quo minus aliquid excudam. De Op. Dei, cap. i. p. 829.

ⁿ Nam & ille colluctator & adversarius noster, scis, quam sit astutus, & idem ipse violentus, sicuti nunc videmus, ib. p. 830.

^o See Tillem. as before, p. 349. and Lact. de Op. Dei, Cap. ult.

bable,

bable, since Lactantius expresseth himself much after the same manner again in the introduction to his Divine Institutions.

7. As those Institutions against the Gentiles, in seven books, are the principal work of Lactantius, we should be glad to settle the time of writing and publishing them. As we now have them, they are inscribed to Constantine. And it is thought, that he refers to the Licinian persecution, which began in the year 319. They were not therefore published before the year 320. So say ^p Basnage and ^a Pagi, whose arguments I have briefly placed in the margin, for the sake of such readers as may not have their works at hand. Du Pin says, that ^r Lactantius wrote his Institutions in the time of Licinius's persecution, which began in 320, and that ^s he undertook that work about the year of Christ 320, if his numbers are rightly printed, which I think cannot be properly said. For it is not a work which could be composed in a short time; and we have proofs of his designing it ^t at the very beginning of Dioclesian's persecution. Tillemont says, that ^u in the condition we now have it, it seems not to have been published before the year 321; and therefore it might be the fruit of the time that Lactantius spent with Crispus in Gaul. Nourry's ^x opinion concerning the time of this work is very little different from theirs: (though in one place he says, that ^y the Institutions were composed a little after the year 311.) He observes, that ^z Lactantius seems not to have been in Bithynia, when he composed this work; therefore he might be in Gaul with Crispus, who was not placed under his tuition, before the year 318. He too supposeth, that ^a Lactantius in this work speaks of the Licinian

^p — quem hoc anno [320.] Divinarum Institutionum libros Constantino nuncupasse existimamus. Ardente quidem Liciniana persecutione editos esse, verbis monemur auctoris: [Inst. l. i. cap. 1.] Nam malis qui adversus justos in aliis terrarum partibus sæviunt, quanto serius, tanto vehementius idem Omnipotens mercedem sceleris exolvat, &c. Basn. Ann. 320. n. iv.

^q Sæviebat itaque tunc Licinii persecutio, quando Lactantius opus illud Constantino dicavit, ideoque non anno 316, ut credidit Baronius, sed post annum 319, in lucem emissum. Pag. in Bar. Ann. 315. n. vii. vid. & 316. n. vi.

^r — il à donc écrit du temps de la persecution de l'empereur Licinius, qui a commencé en 320. Du Pin Bib. T. i. p. 209.

^s Il entreprit ensuite les sept livres des Institutions vers l'an 320 de Jesus Christ. Id. ib. p. 205.

^t Vid. Inst. l. v. cap. 2. p. 460. & c. 4.

p. 470.

^u Tillem. T. 6. P. i. p. 349.

^x Lactantius igitur non ante hunc annum 319, divinarum institutionum libros edidit. Nonne autem roboris ac firmamenti aliquid huic posteriori opinioni inde accedit, quod Lactantius significare videtur se ex Bithynia — prius secessisse, quam — hos libros emisisset in lucem? Non enim profus incepte colligi inde potest eos ab illo compositos, postquam se contulisset in Gallias, atque ibi Crispus in ejus traditus fuisset disciplinam. At id anno 318, aut paulo post contigit. Nourry App. T. ii. p. 632. A. B.

^y Si verior sit secunda opinio, certe Lactantius, qui paulo post annum 311, divinas institutiones composuit — ib. p. 628. B.

^z Inst. l. v. c. xi. p. 490. The words will be cited below at Note (a).

^a Et certe Lactantius Diocletiani in Christianos sevientis immanem crudelitatem — depinxit. Lib. v. Inst. cap. xi. p.

persecution. He does not insist upon the passage in the inscription of the Institutions to Constantine, which is wanting in some manuscripts, but upon some other passages in other parts of that work: where, however, I must own, I cannot yet discern a reference to any persecution, different from that of Dioclesian.

Cave was rather of opinion, that ^b Lactantius composed the Institutions in the time of this last-mentioned persecution. And I beg leave to enlarge in support of his opinion. This work was occasioned ^c by the writings of two heathens of note, who published their pieces against the Christians at the very beginning of the persecution under Dioclesian, as Lactantius expressly assures us. It seems not reasonable to think, that a design, formed by him in 302 or 303, should not be executed before 320. And in several passages of his Institutions, he speaks as ^d if the Christians then suffered under a general persecution, all over the world; whereas the Licinian persecution was in the east only.

Lactantius does indeed speak of some sufferings in the persecution of Dioclesian as ^e past. Which however, I think, is not strange: for though he formed the design of this work at the beginning of that persecution, and carried it on as he had opportunity, in those difficult times; the persecution might be coming to an end, or be quite concluded, before his work was finished and published. By which means he certainly would be able to reflect upon, and take notice of divers events, in several parts of the world, during that long scene of affliction and distress.

490. & seqq. Ast alia his plane similia aut profus eadem adhuc cum hos libros exararet, inscripta sic alibi memorat: Cultores Dei summi, hoc est. justos homines, torquent, interficiunt, &c. ib. cap. i. p. 456. Vid. & cap. 12. p. 493. l. vi. c. 17. p. 603. Nourry ubi supr. p. 631.

^b Scripti sunt hi libri sub Diocletiani persecutione, quod ipse Lactantius, l. v. c. 2, 4. satis aperte testatur: non, quod multi volunt, sub Liciniana. Inscriptiones enim ad Constantinum M. quæ in librorum 1, 2, 4, & 5, fronte comparent, nec antiquiores editiones, nec melioris notæ codices Mss. agnoscunt, ideoque ab aliena manu fluxisse censendæ sunt. Aliter a stilo Lactantiano non multum abhorrent. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 162.

^c Ego cum in Bithynia oratorias literas accitus docerem, contigissetque, ut eodem tempore Dei templum everteretur, duo exsisterunt ibidem, qui jacenti, atque abjectæ veritati, nescio utrum super-

bis, an importunius insultarent. Infl. l. v. c. 2. p. 460. Ii ergo, de quibus dixi, cum præsentem me, ac dolente, sacrilegas suas literas explicassent: & illorum superba impietate stimulatus, — suscepi hoc munus — ib. c. 4. p. 470.

^d Hæc enim populus noster patitur omnia, errantium pravitate. Ecce in eo est errore civitas, vel potius orbis ipse totus, ut bonos & justos viros tanquam malos & impios persequatur, excruciet, damnet, occidat, ib. l. v. c. 12. p. 403. Spectatæ sunt enim, spectanturque adhuc per orbem pœnæ cultorum Dei: in quibus excruciantis nova & inusitata tormenta excogitata sunt, l. vi. c. 17. p. 603.

^e Quæ autem per totum orbem singuli gesserint, enarrare impossibile est. Quis enim voluminum numerus capiet tam infinita, tam varia genera crudelitatis? Accepta enim potestate, pro suis viribus quisque sævivit, ib. l. v. c. 11. p. 490.

And

And when I read the Institutions, I am disposed to consider them, as a work composed, for the most part at least, under the persecution of Dioclesian; though perhaps they were not published till after it was over. It is likely, that others in reading this work, experience the like sentiments. For some have supposed, that ^f there were two editions of this work; that is, one before that which we now have, with the inscriptions to Constantine: and others, supported by the authority of a good number of manuscript copies, think those ^h inscriptions not genuine.

Before I proceed, I would observe one thing more; that it is not likely, the long argument against persecution, in the fifth book of the Institutions, should be written after Dioclesian's persecution was over. And the last chapter of that book seems to shew, that ⁱ as yet there was no Christian emperor: that the persecuting princes were still living, and that their persecutions were not yet come to an end. And in the Epitome of the same work there are expressions, intimating, that ^k some of those persecuting princes, or chief instruments

^f Si vobis sapientes videmur, imitamini: si stulti, contemnite, aut etiam ridete, si libet. — Quid laceratis? quid affligitis? l. v. c. 12. sub in. Cur enim tam crudeliter sciant, nisi quia metuumt, ne in dies invalescente iustitia, cum diis suis araneosis relinquantur? eod. cap. sub fin.

& Dici etiam potest, Lactantium bis hoc opus edidisse, (quod idem Tertulliani Apologetico factum esse constat:) prius ante regnum Constantini, iterum eo rerum potito. Heuman. ad Inst. l. i. c. 1. p. 6.

Sane Lactantius libros Divinarum Institutionum scripsit furente persecutione, in ipsis ejus initiis, ut ex capite secundo & quarto libri quinti colligitur: sed non emisit, impeditus videlicet & rei & temporis necessitate. — At quum data esset pax. — Itaque tum Lactantius Divinarum Institutionum libros, in quibus loca quedam sparsim reperiuntur, quæ manifeste constat scripta esse post bellum sedatum atque extinctum, recensuit, pleraque addidit, in primis vero ea quæ in initiis librorum & in epilogo dicuntur ad Constantinum, quæ perperam nonnulli judicant notha esse & supposititia. — Sed haud dubie duæ antiquissimæ fuere Divinarum Institutionum editiones. — Qui vero priore editione usi sunt, ea profecto non habuerunt quæ postea de Constantino addita sunt. Baluz. annot. ad lib. de M. P. sub. in. Et Conf. Tillem. ubi supr. p. 349. & 466. &c. Vid. &

Thomaf. not. ad Inst. l. i. c. 1: p. 6. edit. Heumanni.

^h Inclusa de Constantino ad num. 17. absunt a pluribus Mss. quinque Vaticanis, & duobus Bononiensibus, Mich. Thomasio teste: ab Anglicanis aliquot, & primo Lipsiensis. Habent Gothanus, reliqui Lipsienses, alii codices. Damnat Josephus Isaac non una ratione, quasi non congruentia temporibus. Tuetur Stephanus Baluzius — & tristibus temporibus scriptas Institutiones putat: letioribus autem emendatas, auctas, & Constantino dedicatas. Cellar. ad eund. loc. ap. Heuman. ed. p. 6.

ⁱ Quicquid vero adversum nos mali principes moliantur, fieri ipse permittit. Et tamen injustissimi persecutores, quibus Dei nomen contumeliæ ac ludibrio fuit, non se putent impune laturos, quia indignationis adversus nos ejus quasi ministri fuerunt. Punientur enim judicio Dei qui accepta potestate supra humanum modum fuerint abusi. — Qua propter non sperent sacrilegæ animæ, contemptos & insultos fore, quos sic obterunt. Inst. l. v. c. 23.

^k — nec re nec verbo pugnamus, sed mites & taciti, & patientes perferimus omnia. — Habemus enim fiduciam in Deo, a quo expectamus securam protinus ultionem. Nec est inanis illa fiducia. Siquidem eorum omnium, qui hoc facinus ausi sunt, miserabiles exitus partim cognovimus, partim videmus. Epit. c. 53. p. 150. ed. Davidf.

in Dioclesian's persecution, had died miserably, whilst one or more of them still survived : which might lead us to think, that the Epitome itself was composed not later than the year 311, 312, or 313.

As for the mention, which is made of the Arians in one^l place, it was an easy addition. But it is difficult to defend the genuineness of that clause upon^m any supposition concerning the date of the Institutions.

After all, how much soever I have desired it, I do not imagine, that I have clearly fixed the time of writing and publishing this work ; but yet I was willing to set before my readers a state of the question. And I persuade myself, that in the year 306. Lactantius had begun the work, the design of which was formed in 303. I therefore choose to consider him as flourishing in the quality of a Christian writer about the year 306.

This work Lactantius intended not only as an answer to the two authors before taken notice of, butⁿ as a general answer, and full confutation of all others, who already had, or hereafter might oppose the Christian doctrine.

It is a noble work, and has received just praises from^o Jerom. I put in the margin a passage of^p Lactantius, which that author refers to. Nevertheless, perhaps this work would have been more curious and entertaining to us now, if he had inserted more particularly the objections of those two writers,

^l Cum enim Phryges, aut — Marcionitæ aut Anthropiani, aut Ariani, seu quilibet alii nominantur. Inst. l. iv. c. 30. p. 449.

^m Mais en quelque temps qu'on dise qu'a écrit Lactance, il est bien difficile de croire qu'il ait pu parler des Ariens comme d'herétiques declarez, ce qu'on ne peut presque pas dire avoir esté avant le concile de Nicée, & apres toutes les persecutions. Il seroit mesme assez aisé de montrer par la lettre de Constantin à S. Alexandre & à Arius, que jusqu'à la fin de l'ann. 323. l'herésie d'Arius n'avoit encore fait que peu ou point de bruit dans l'Occident. De sorte que pour soutenir que le mot d'Ariani est véritablement de Lactance, — il faudroit rapporter se qu'il dit de la persecution qui duroit encore alors en quelques endroits, non à celle de Licinius, mais à celle de Sapor, &c. Tillem. Note iv. sur Lactance. Mem. T. 6. P. i. p. 469. So Tillemont. However they, who are desirous of seeing somewhat on the other side, may consult Dr. Heumann's note upon the passage of Lactantius, where the Arians are mentioned.

ⁿ — suscepi hoc opus : ut omnibus ingenii mei viribus accusatores justitiæ vindicarem : non ut contra hos scriberem, qui paucis verbis obteri poterant ; sed ut omnes, qui ubique idem operis efficiunt aut effecerunt, uno simul impetu profligare. Inst. l. v. c. 4. p. 470.

^o Firmianus quoque nosse in præclaro Institutionum suarum opere Y literæ meminit : & de dextris ac sinistris, hoc est, de virtutibus & vitiis plenissime disputat. Hieron. Comm. in Ecc. cap. x. T. 2. p. 770. Quis mihi interdicere potest, ne legam Institutionum ejus libros, quibus contra gentes scripsit fortissime ? Id. ad Pam. & Oc. Ep. 41. al. 65. T. 4. p. 345.

^p Omnis hæc de duabus viis disputatio ad frugalitatem ac luxuriam spectat. Dicunt enim humanæ vitæ cursum Y literæ esse similem, quod unusquisque hominum, cum primum adolescentiæ limen attingerit, & in eum locum venerit, partes ubi se via dividit in ambas ; hæreat nutabundus, ac nesciat in quam se partem inclinet. Si ducem nactus fuerit, qui dirigat ad meliora titubantem, &c. Inst. l. vi. c. 3. p. 550, 551.

that

that were the first occasion of it. But Lactantius despised them too much, to do them that honour. And, as before observed, he intended his work should contain a general confutation of all objectors and adversaries whatever.

8. We have also the Epitome of the Divine Institutions, inscribed by Lactantius to his brother Pentadius; which was imperfect at the beginning in St. Jerom's copy, and was so likewise in ours, until it was found in the library of the king of Sardinia at Turin, by Dr. Christopher Matthew Pfaff, and published by him intire, or nearly so, at Paris in 1712, to the great joy of the learned world. A curious account of the manuscript, and the fortunate discovery of it, may be read in Dr. Pfaff's Preliminary Dissertation, and in Mr. La Roche's ¹ Memoirs of Literature. This abridgment is an useful book, containing in it some things not to be found in the Institutions themselves.

9. The book of the Wrath or Anger of God, is likewise still extant. It is particularly commended by ² Jerom, as a learned and elegant piece, and a completè treatise upon the subject.

10. Beside thetè there is a well-known book of the Deaths of Persecutors, which was first published by Stephen Baluze in the second volume of his Miscellanea, in the year 1679. But this has not been so universally reckoned genuine, as the beginning of the Epitome, published by Dr. Pfaff.

It is however a very valuable work, containing a short account of the sufferings of Christians under severall of the Roman emperors, from the death and resurrection of Christ to Dioclesian: and then a particular history of the persecution raised by that emperor, and the causes and springs of it; as likewise the miserable deaths of the chief instruments therein. Here we learn divers remarkable facts, recorded no where else.

It would be tedious to observe particularly all that might be said, relating to the dispute concerning the author of this work. I therefore refer to ³ Baluze, ⁴ Fabricius, ⁵ Heumann, and ⁶ some others, for the arguments, that it is a work of Lactantius, and to ⁷ Nourry on the other side.

¹ Vol. v. p. 184. and 395. &c. in the second edition.

² Firmianus noster librum de Ira Dei docto pariter & eloquenti sermone conscripsit, quem qui legerit, puto ei ad iræ intellectum satis abundeque posse sufficere. Hieron. Comm. in Ephes. cap. iv. ver. 26. p. 373.

³ Baluz. Miscell. l. ii. p. 351, 352. & not. ad lib. de M. P. p. 7, 8. &c. edit. Ulm. 1693.

⁴ Fabric. not. (b) & (c)

ad Hieron. de V. I. cap. 80. in Biblioth. Ecc. p. 165, 166. Vid. & ejusd. Bibl. Lat. Vol. iii. p. 403, 404.

⁵ Vid. Heumann. App. i. ad symp. Lact. & ejus. Præf. ad Lactant. Opp.

⁶ Dan Maichelli Introd. ad Hist. Lit. p. 187, &c. Cantabr. 1721. & Journal. Littéraire. Tom. 7. P. i. p. 1—29. à la Haye, 1715.

⁷ Diss. in L. Cecil. de M. P. Paris. 1710. & in App. ad Bib. P. P. p. 1642, &c.

Fabricius, in particular, thinks Nourry's reasons for robbing Lactantius of this piece to be of little weight; far from being sufficient ground for introducing a new author, named Lucius Cecilius, unknown to all antiquity. However, as I am obliged to deliver my opinion, I shall support it with a few observations, referring to Nourry for the rest.

The book, published by Baluze, is ascribed ^a in the Colbertine manuscript, the only one of it in being, to Lucius Cecilius. It is not easy to conceive, why the transcriber of this book should not have added Firmianus Lactantius, if it is his. And the forenames, Lucius Cœlius, or Cæcilius, are very rarely given to Lactantius. Fabricius ^a mentions only one author, Bernardinus de Buis, of the fifteenth century, and two manuscripts; one of the books commonly ascribed to Lactantius, the other of his book, *Of the Workmanship of God*; in which Lactantius is called at length Lucius Cœlius, or Cæcilius Firmianus Lactantius. Methinks, this ^b is not sufficient ground for giving those two names to this learned ancient; when he is called only Firmianus Lactantius, or Firmianus, or Lactantius singly, by Jerom, Eucherius, ^c Augustine, ^d Apollinaris Sidonius, Honorius of Autun, Trithemius. Not to say any thing of Freculph's and Ado's Chronicles, though they also use the same way of writing. And moreover, in almost all the manuscript copies of his works, or of some part of them, (as is owned) he is called only Firmianus Lactantius.

Then the title of the book, published by Baluze, is different from that of Lactantius in Jerom. It is intitled, *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*: but that mentioned by Jerom is, *Of the Persecution*: so likewise in Honorius and Trithemius, without any variation. This appears to me considerable. If Lactantius's book had been intitled, *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*, it would have been so described by Jerom. If it had obtained that title, and had been ever so called in a few ages after, either in ma-

^a Lucii Cecili. Incipit liber ad Donatum Confessorem de Moribus Persecutorum.

^a — licet in Sermonibus Bernardini de Buis nominatus Lucius Cæcilius Firmianus, teste Bernardo Moneto. T. 4. Menagiorum p. 85. Fabr. ubi supr. in Bib. Ecc. p. 165. Cum denique Lactantium & in Sermonibus Bernardini de Buis, quos paulo ante memorabam, & in Codice Colbertino 507. & Codice Taurinensi libri de Opificio Dei, quem inspexit Pfaffius, Lucium Cœlium Lactantium appellari, non possit negari. Id. ib. p. 166. Conf. Baluz. Misc. T. ii. p. 352.

^b Ausim & hoc dicere, Firmianum Lactantium Lucii Cæcili nomine nunquam appellatum fuisse, quod nulla quidem probatione indigere videtur, utpote nulla antiquioris MS. Codicis auctoritate nixum. Pfaff. Diss. Præl. § 12. p. 16. Quid si dixerim, nec Lucium Cœlium nomen esse ad F. Lactantium pertinens; sed a recentioribus solum librariis, nimis sæpius, ut par est, sapientibus additum? Id. ib. § 13. p. 17.

^c De Civ. Dei. l. xviii. c. 23.

^d — instruit ut Hieronymus, destruit ut Lactantius. Sidon. lib. iv. Ep. 3. p. 92.

nuscripts, or in learned writers who quoted it; it is reasonable to suppose, that so late writers as Honorius and Trithemius, one of the twelfth, the other of the fifteenth century, would have mentioned it by that title alone; or else would have mentioned the two titles together.

This book, *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*, is inscribed to * Donatus, a confessor, who had suffered six years imprisonment, and other hardships for the sake of Christianity, in Dioclesian's persecution. And the book of Lactantius concerning the Wrath of God, is dedicated to one Donatus, a friend of his. This therefore has been reckoned an argument, that Lactantius must be the author of the book, of which we are speaking. But I should rather think it an argument on the other side: for as ^f Tillemont observes, (though he makes no doubt of its being a genuine work of Lactantius,) the book, *Of the Wrath of God*, was written after the Institutions, and consequently after the persecution. But yet Lactantius does not there call Donatus an illustrious confessor. He ^e even speaks to him, as to a novice, 'who needed to be instructed and fortified, lest he should be misled by the authority of the wise men of the world.'

Finally, not to mention other things, the style of this book appears to me far from equalling that of Lactantius. Nevertheless ^b Baluze, and others are of a different opinion. Every one must judge for himself: but for my own part, I cannot here discern the style of Lactantius; nor does ⁱ Pfaff, nor ^k yet Dr. Heumann, though he maintains the genuineness of the book.

As for the words and phrases found both in this book, and in the undisputed writings of Lactantius, which have been observed by Columbus in his notes upon this book, and have been since put together, and insisted on by La Croze, the au-

^e Novies enim tormentis cruciatibusque variis subiectus, novies adversarium gloriosa confessione vicisti, &c. de M. P. c. 16. Tunc apertis carceribus, Donate carissime, cum cæteris confessoribus e custodia liberatus es, cum tibi carcer sex annis pro domicilio fuerit, ib. c. 35. Vid. & cap. i.

^f Mem. Ec. T. 6. P. i. p. 352.

^g Quorum error, quia maximus est, & ad evitandum vitæ humanæ statum spectat; coarguendos est a nobis, ne ipse fallaris, impulsus auctoritate hominum, qui se putant esse sapientes. Lact. De Ira Dei. Cap. i. p. 764.

^h Nam & stylus omnino Lactantianus est, ut facile periti illarum rerum agnoscent. Baluz. Misc. ib. p. 315.

ⁱ Non hic eam eloquentiæ dicendique

vim, non eum orationis florem, verborumque copiam inveneris, quæ passim in Epitoma; apparet: cum e contrario Lucii Cæcili stylus sit inæqualis, lentus & mediocris. Pfaff. ib. § xi. p. 15.

^k Illud ad ultimum celare meos lectores nolo, nondum videri mihi librum hunc satis emendavisse & exasialse Lactantium. — Ac hanc ipsam esse causam existimo, cur hujus libri stylus non ubique æquet elegantiam cæterorum Lactantii librorum. — Nec ex oratione solum negligentiore apparet, primam quasi delineationem libri, non librum satis perpolitum, nos habere; sed ex ipsa quoque tractatione, quæ passim multum obscuritatis habet, &c. Heuman. in Præf. ad Lact.

thor of a Dissertation, or Letter, printed in the ¹ Literary Journal at the Hague, to prove the genuineness of this piece; I think that argument more specious than solid. For it is not at all strange, that the same words and phrases should occur in two different authors of the same age, and even contemporaries: especially when one of them was a celebrated master of rhetoric, and the politest writer, and the most learned man of his time among the Latins. Many might imitate, though they did not equal him. Add to all this, that the subjects of Lactantius and of this author often coincide: they are both zealous Christians, and engaged in the defence of their religion; they have both occasion to speak of the death, and resurrection and ascension of Jesus, and of the affairs of Christians from their first original in the world, and particularly of the persecution that happened in their own time, and the chief agents in it. But though both use some of the same words and phrases, the style of the author of the Deaths of Persecutors is not the style of Lactantius, but much inferior to it, so far as I am able to judge.

Nourry is not the only person, who has denied, or doubted of the genuineness of this book. The famous Christopher Cellarius^m speaks doubtfully of the matter, in his Brief Account of the Life of Lactantius, prefixed to the edition of his works, published in 1698, and therefore long before Nourry wrote his Dissertation, which was first printed at Paris in the year 1710, and since in his Apparatus in 1715. I learn also from Dr. Heumann, that ⁿ Mr. Walch, another learned German editor of Lactantius, does not without hesitation ascribe this work to his author. The editors of cardinal Noris's works think, the * author of this book a different writer from Lactantius, though certainly contemporary with him. And they have proposed some very good observations in favour of their opinion. Dr. Pfaff, in his Preliminary Dissertation to the Epitome of Lac-

¹ Journal Literaire, T. 7. P. i. p. 25, &c. à la Haye. 1715. ^m De Mortibus Persecutorum liber, nuper repertus, si Lactantii est, ut fere viri doctissimi consentiunt. Cellar. Exc. de Vita Lact.

ⁿ Adjungo, — Cl. Walchium, qui & ipse in suis ad novissimam Lactantii operum editionem Prolegomenis cap. v. p. 38. dubitavit, an liber ille sit genuinus Lactantii scriptus. Heuman. in App. i. ad Lact. Symp. § 4 p. 215.

^o Libri autem inscriptio, de mortibus persecutorum, diversum opus indicat ab illo, quod ab Hieronymo Lac-

tantio tribuitur cum titulo de persecutione. Etenim Lactantius historiam suppliciorum, quæ Christiani a persecutoribus passi sunt, concinnasse videtur: Lucius autem Cæcilius contexuit historiam suppliciorum, quibus ipsi Christianorum persecutores multati sunt. — Hæ conjectationes, tametsi non omnino demonstrent, convincunt tamen probabilius alium a Lactantio esse L. Cæcilius hujus libelli auctorem — Sed quicumque sit hujus libri scriptor, dum consulet eum fuisse Lactantio supparem, parum interest. Ap. Noris. Opp. T. iv. p. 36, 37.

tantius,

tantius⁹, expresse his approbation of Nourry's arguments. Le Clerc too, was fully satisfied with⁹ Nourry's reasons. The writer of Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors ancient and modern, published at London in 1732, says, that⁹ 'he is inclined to agree with those who think, that the author of this book is not Lactantius.' Signor Maffei, referring to this book, does not quote it as⁹ certainly written by Lactantius. The late learned John Davis, who published an edition of our author's Epitome, does⁹ not positively assert him to be the writer of the book Of the Deaths of Persecutors. The same may be observed of⁹ Mr. Turretin. However, such a thing as this is not to be decided by authorities; nor do I think the reasons that have been alleged by me to be conclusive and demonstrative: but they appear to be of some weight; and therefore I choose not to quote this, as a work of Lactantius, until I am better satisfied about it.

11. I need not say any thing particularly of the poems de Phœnice, de Pascha, de Passione Domini, which have been thought by some to belong to our author, and are joined with his works in most editions. They are not mentioned by Jerom, and are now generally supposed to have been without good reason ascribed to Lactantius.

12. The editions of Lactantius are very numerous. Du Pin has referred to a good many of them: but a more full and copious catalogue may be seen in⁹ Fabricius: Nourry likewise has an article⁹ of the editions of Lactantius. And Dr. Heumann has inserted an account of them in the preface to his own edition, formerly mentioned: which appears to me very valuable for the correctness of it, as well as on other accounts. But I wish that learned man had put out our author in a quarto volume: he might then have made use of a larger letter, and might have added some things, which are omitted for want of room.

13. I somewhat wonder, that no learned editor of Lactantius has published his works according to the order of time, the present order being manifestly preposterous. The Sympo-

⁹ Vid. Pfaff. Diss. n. xii. p. 16.

⁹ — marques certaines, comme il me semble, aussi bien qu' au P. Le Nourry, que cet ouvrage n'est point de Lactance. Bib. A. & M. T. iii. p. 438. ^r See those Observations, Vol. ii. p. 232.

⁹ — e dell' altre buona ragione si può dedurre da Lattanzio, se di lui è il libro delle morte de Persecutori. Maff. Veron.

Illustrat. P. i. p. 149:

^r Hanc rem fuisse monstravit aut nosse, aut quisquis est auctor libri de mortibus Persecutorum, &c. Davis. Annot. in Epit. cap. 53. p. 150.

^u Lactantius vel quisquis alius est auctor libri non pridem emissi, de M. Persecutorum, Turret. Comp. Hist. Ec. p. 29.

^x Bib. Lat. V. iii. p. 304, &c. Hamb.

^y Vid. Ap. T. ii. p. 651, &c.

sum should come first, if its genuineness can be admitted; otherwise it must be placed at the end: then the book, *Of the Workmanship of God*; next the *Institutions*, and their *Epitome*; after that the book, *Of the Wrath, or Anger of God*. The book, *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*, should by all means stand last, because its genuineness is not universally acknowledged, and because it is a thing of quite a different nature from all the other remaining works of Lactantius. They (excepting the *Banquet or Symposium*;) are all argumentative, this historical.

Nor do I well know, why in all late editions there are no summaries, or brief contents of the several chapters. There are such things in the edition of Sebastian Gryphius at Lyons, in 1541. and in an edition² at Geneva, above a hundred years since. When they began to be omitted, or for what reasons, I cannot tell.

I have mentioned these things, leaving it to the learned to judge of them, as they think fit. But though there have been so many editions of Lactantius, Le Clerc said in 1719. that³ he did not know of one good edition of this writer, the most elegant of all the Latin fathers.

III. Before I proceed to his testimony to the Scriptures, I shall set before my readers some remarkable things, which I have observed in the writings of this author.

1. Lactantius often speaks of the nature and design of the Christian revelation, as^b suited to promote the general good of all, of every age, sex, and condition: so that all may attain to just sentiments of God, and be directed and assisted in the way of holiness, and obtain everlasting happiness. And he asserts it to be in the power of the^c meanest and poorest of men to attain to righteousness.

2. He sometimes glories^d in the great and happy effects of the Christian doctrine upon the minds and lives of men: ren-

² Geneva ap. Joann. De Fournes, 1630:

³ — de sorte qu'on peut dire, que jusqu'à présent nous n'avons point de bonne édition de plus elegant de tous le Peres Latines. Bib. A. & M. T. xi. p. 201.

^b Nobis autem, qui sacramentum veræ religionis accepimus, cum sit veritas revelata divinitus: cum doctorem sapientiæ duce[m]que veritatis Deum sequamur; universos sine ullo discrimine vel sexus, vel ætatis, ad cœlestis pabulum convocamus. *Inst.* l. i. c. 1. p. 8 & 9. Nos autem omnis sexus & generis & ætatis in hoc cœleste iter inducimus, quia Deus, qui ejus viz

dux est, immortalitatem nulli homini nato negat, l. vi. c. 3. p. 552.

^c Quasi vero in judicibus solis atque in potestate aliqua constitutis justitia esse debeat, & non in omnibus. Atqui nullus est hominum, ne infimorum quidem ac mendicorum, in quem justitia cadere non possit. *Epit.* cap. 55.

^d Dei autem præcepta, quia & simplicia & vera sunt, quantum valeant in animis hominum, quotidiana experimenta demonstrant. Da mihi virum, qui sit iracundus, maledicus, effrænatus: paucissimis Dei verbis tam placidum quam ovem reddam. Da cupidum, avarum, tenacem: jam tibi eum

dering the proud humble, the hasty and passionate meek and mild, the lewd chaste, the covetous liberal, and converting the unrighteous and cruel to justice and mercy. For which reason he recommends this divine religion, as ^e the medicine of the soul, effectual for healing all its diseases.

3. Lactantius understood the words in Gen. vi. 3. *Yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years*, of the ^f appointed term of human life after the flood.

4. This Latin Christian ^g asserts the freedom of man's will, or his power to do good or evil.

5. Lactantius has not quoted many Christian authors. He has however mentioned ^h Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Cyprian, and ⁱ Theophilus, bishop of Antioch in the second century.

6. Lactantius has made very particular mention of ^k two persons, who in his own time wrote against the Christian religion. And he supposeth, there might be others who ^l did the like about the same time, as well as ^m in former times.

liberalem dabo, & pecuniam suam plenis manibus largientem. — Da libidinosum, adulterum, ganeonem: jam sobrium, castum, continentem videbis. Da crudelem, & sanguinis appetentem: jam in veram clementiam furor isle mutabitur. Da injustum, insipientem, peccatorem: continuo & æquus, & prudens, & innocens erit. — Gratis ista fiunt, facile, cito. — Nemo vereatur. Nos aquam non vendimus, nec solem mercede præstamus, l. iii. c. 26. p. 328, 329. ^e — quibus [vulneribus] nemo alius mederi potest, nisi solus ille, qui gressum claudis, visum cæcis reddidit, — mortuos excitavit. Ille ardorem cupiditatis exstinguet, extirpabit libidines, invidiam distrahet, iram mitigabit. Ille reddet veram & perpetuam sanitatem. Appetenda est hæc omnibus medicina, quoniam majori periculo vexatur anima, quam corpus, &c. l. vi. c. 24. p. 636.

^f — paulatim per singulas progenies diminuit hominis ætatem, usque in centum & xx annis metam collocavit, quam transgredi non liceret. Inst. l. ii. c. 13. in. Vid. & cap. 12. ad fin. Nam post diluvium paulatim vita hominum breviata, & ad annos centum viginti redacta est. Epit. cap. 27.

^g — sed sola est virtus, sola justitia, quæ potest verum bonum — judicari; quia nec datur cuiquam, nec aufertur. Inst. l. iv. c. 16. p. 491.

Dux vitæ homini attributæ sunt, una temporalis, — altera sempiterna — Illam primam nescientes accepimus, hanc secun-

dam scientes. Virtuti enim, non naturæ datur. — Idcirco hanc præsentem dedit, ut illam veram & perpetuam aut vitiis amittamus, aut virtute mereamur. — In illa vero spiritali, quam per nos ipsi acquirimus, summum bonum continetur. — Nam nihil interesset inter justum & injustum, siquidem omnis homo natus, immortalis fieret. Ergo immortalitas non sequela naturæ, sed merces præmiumque virtutis est. Inst. l. vii. c. 5. p. 663, 664.

Idcirco nobis Deus virtutem justitiamque proponit, ut æternum illud præmium nostris laboribus assequamur. Epit. cap. 35.

^h Vid. Inst. l. v. c. 1. & 4.

ⁱ Theophilus in libro de temporibus ad Autolyceum scripto ait, l. i. c. 23. sub in.

^k Ego cum in Bithynia oratorias literas accitus docerem, & eodem tempore Dei templum everteretur; duo extiterunt ibidem, — Quorum alter antifistitem se philosophiæ profitebatur — Alius eandem materiam mordacius scripsit, qui erat tum e numero judicum, l. v. c. 2. vid. & cap. 3. & cap. 4. init.

^l — non ut contra hos scriberem, qui paucis verbis obteri poterant; sed ut omnes, qui ubique idem operis efficiunt aut effecerunt, uno semel impetu profligare. Non dubito enim, quin & alii plurimi, & multis in locis, & non modo Græcis, sed etiam Latinis literis, monumentum injustitiæ suæ struxerint, l. v. c. 4. in.

^m Omitto eos, qui prioribus eam temporibus nequicquam lacefferunt, l. v. c. 2. sub. in.

7. He also mentions one ^a Domitius, supposed ^o to be the famous Lawyer Domitianus Ulpianus, who made a collection of Imperial Edicts that had been published against the Christians.

8. He intimates, that ^p there were in his time many Christians, especially such as had a smattering of learning, who wavered in the profession of Christianity.

9. We do not observe in Lactantius any notice taken of those scandalous reflections upon the Christians, which we can find by our writers were common in the second century. By the continued purity of their lives, and the force of their Apologies, it is likely they had confuted and obliterated those calumnies.

But they were still reckoned a silly ^q and contemptible people, partly for ^r following a crucified master and leader, partly ^s for suffering so many evils which they might have avoided. Moreover, they were still called ^t impious and profane for deriding the common deities, and not complying with the established superstition: and desperadoes ^u on account of their uncommon resolution and steadiness in the profession of their own peculiar principles, which they believed to be true.

10. Lactantius openly asserts the innocence of Christian ^x people, all whose religion, he says, consists in good works, or

^a Domitius de Officio Proconsulis libro septimo rescripta Principum nefaria collegit, ut doceret, quibus poenis affici oporteret eos, qui se cultores Dei confiterentur, l. v. c. 11. fin.

^o Vid. Heuman. Annot. in loc. ^p Nam si lucrari hos a morte, ad quam concitatissime tendunt, non poterimus; — nostros tamen confirmabimus, quorum non est stabilis ac solidis radicibus fundata & fixa sententia. Nutant enim plurimi, ac maxime, qui literarum aliquid attigerunt, l. v. c. 1. p. 457.

^q Si vobis sapientes videmur, imitamini; si stulti, contemnite, aut etiam ridete, si libet: nobis enim stultitia nostra prodest, l. v. c. 12. p. 492. Suam — sibi habeant sapientiam prudentes. Relinquant nobis stultitiam nostram, ib. p. 493.

^r Venio nunc ad ipsam passionem, quæ velut opprobrium nobis objectari solet, quod & hominem, & ab hominibus insigni supplicio affectum & ex cruciatum colamus, l. iv. c. 16. in.

^s Docui, ut opinor, cur populus noster apud stultos stultus habeatur. Nam cruciari, atque interfici malle, quam thura tribus digitis comprehensa in focum jactare, tui ineptum videtur, quam in periculo vivere, alterius animam magis curare, quam suam, l. v. c. 18. p. 513.

^t Impios

enim vocant, ipsi scilicet pii, & ab humano sanguine abhorrentes. — l. v. c. 9. p. 483. — nec maledictis abstinent, sed quantæ possunt verborum contumeliis infestantur. Epit. c. 52. Sed soli ex omnibus impii judicantur, qui Deum, qui veritatem sequuntur. Quæ cum sit eadem justitia, eadem sapientia, hanc isti vel impietatis vel stultitiæ crimine infamant, &c. ib. c. 55.

^u Qui autem magni æstimaverint fidem, cultoresque Dei se non abnegaverint, in eos vero totis carnificinæ suæ viribus veluti sanguinem sitiant, incumbunt, & desperatos vocant, quia corpori suo minime parcunt, l. v. c. 9. p. 483. — & hanc adversus innocentes carnificinam exercentes, pios utique se & justos & religiosos putant. — illos vero impios & desperatos nuncupant. Epit. c. 54. ^x Nostro autem populo quid horum potest obijci? cujus omnis religio est, sine seelere ac sine macula vivere, l. v. c. 9. p. 485.

Dicit hic aliquis: Quæ ergo, aut ubi, aut qualis est pietas? Nimirum apud eos, qui bella nesciunt, qui concordiam cum hominibus servant, qui amici suat etiam inimicis, qui omnes homines pro fratribus diligunt, — l. v. c. 10. p. 487.

Et quoniam communiter cum deorum

a care

a care to live unblameably and inoffensively. And ⁷ the criminals, who fell under the sentence of the magistrate for robbery and other offences, he observes, were not Christians, but of the same religion with their enemies.

11. Lactantius expresseth himself, as if in his time Christians ^a performed miracles in dispossessing dæmons. The author, Of the Deaths of Persecutors, has somewhat ^a to the like purpose.

12. Our author was of opinion, that another life, or a future state of happiness for good men, may be proved by reason.

1.) Entering upon this subject at the beginning of the seventh and last book of the Institutions, he says, he ^b intends to prove a future state by testimonies of Scripture, and by arguments from reason.

2.) The ^c expectation of a better, and a more durable life, he says, is agreeable to philosophy, or natural reason, as well as revelation.

3.) Since ^d man is capable of virtue, there must be another and endless life. For ^e in this world virtue often proves to the prejudice and detriment of men. But forasmuch as virtue is excellent, and it is allowed that they act wisely, who now deny themselves sensual gratifications, and endure pain, and even death itself, rather than not perform their duty; there must be a future recompence for such persons, consisting of better

cultoribus loquimur, liceat per vos, benefacere vobiscum. Hæc est enim lex nostra, hoc opus, hæc religio, l. v. c. 12. sub in.

^f Non enim de nostro, sed ex illorum numero semper existunt, qui vias oblideant amati, maria prædentur, &c. l. v. c. 9. p. 483, 484.

^g Justos autem, id est, cultores Dei, metuunt: cujus nomine adjurati de corporibus excedunt: quorum verbis tanquam flagris verberati non modo demonas se esse consentunt, sed etiam nomina sua edunt, illa quæ in templis adorantur. — Itaque maximis sæpe ululatibus editis, verberari se, & ardere, & jam jamque exire, proclamant. Inst. l. ii. c. 15. p. 220. Vid. & l. iv. c. 27. p. 439, 440, 441. & l. v. c. 21. in. & c. 22. sub fin. & Epit. c. 51.

^h Tum quidam ministrorum scientes Dominum, cum assisterent immolanti, imposuerunt frontibus suis immortale signum. Quo facto, fugatis dæmonibus, sacra turbata sunt. Trepidabant auspices, nec solitas in extis notas videbant, & quasi non litassent, sæpius immolabant, &c. De M. P. c. 10. in.

ⁱ Satis & huic parti faciamus tum testimoniis divinarum literarum, tum etiam probabilibus argumentis, l. vii. c. 1. ^j Si autem superest

homini vita melior & longior, (quod & philosophorum magnorum argumentis, & vatum responsis, & prophetarum divinis vocibus discimus:) l. v. c. 18. sub in.

^k Virtus quoque soli homini data magno argumento est, immortales esse animas: quæ non erit secundum naturam, si anima exstinguitur. Huic enim præsentis vitæ nocet, &c. l. vii. c. 9. p. 677.

^l Si autem virtus malum non est, facitque honeste, quod voluptates vitiosas turpesque contemnit, & fortiter, quod nec dolorem, nec mortem timet, ut officium servet; ergo majus ali-quod bonum assequatur necesse est, quam sunt illa, quæ spernit. At vero morte suscepta, quod ulterius bonum sperari potest, nisi æternitatis? l. vii. c. 9. ad fin.

Virtus autem nunquam, nisi morte, finitur: quoniam & in morte suscipienda summum ejus officium est. Ergo præmium virtutis post mortem est, l. vii. c. 10. p. 679.

Quod si virtus, quæ bona omnia terrena contemnit, mala universa sapientissime perfert, ipsamque mortem pro officio suscipit, sine præmio esse non potest; quid superest, nisi ut merces ejus immortalitas sola sit? Epit. c. 35. in.

things than those they have resigned. But what recompence, excepting immortality, can be given to those, one great part of whose virtue consists in dying well?

4.) In this manner Lactantius frequently argues. If ^f there is no future state, he acts most discreetly who consults his present interest. But if there is another life after this, he who suffers greatly here may act wisely, because immortality will be a full recompence.

5.) He observes, that ^g in fact it is seen, that good men are here despised and ill treated for virtue itself, or for righteousness sake; therefore they must be happy in another state.

6.) There ^h is not any thing, he says, so reasonable, fit, and excellent in itself as virtue: but yet, if there is no other life, there is nothing more foolish and insignificant. God therefore, for certain, has appointed for it a great reward in another state.

7.) He argues likewise, and, as seems to me, excellently, that [†] virtue is in its own nature perpetual, and always progressive. It is not reasonable therefore to suppose, that this principle, once begun and formed in the mind of man, should be cut off, and be for ever destroyed by providence.

8.) He argues strongly, that ⁱ there can be no religion, if God does not reward and punish men according to their actions.

9.) Truly, he ^k says, an excellent being ought to be honoured: but to what purpose, if he takes no notice of it?

10.) He more than once argues to this purpose. Take ^l away the hope of eternal happiness, and the pursuit of truth;

^f Si enim post mortem nihil sumus, profecto stultissimi est hominis, non huic vitæ consulere, ut sit quam diutina & omnibus bonis plena. Quod qui faciet, a justitiæ regula discedat necesse est. — Si autem superest homini vita melior & longior, — hanc præsentem cum suis bonis contemnere sapientis est, cujus omnis jactura immortalitate pensatur, l. v. c. 18. sub in.

^g Deinde qui justitiam sequentes, in hac vita miseri fuerint & contemti & inopes, & ob ipsam justitiam contumeliis & injuriis sæpe vexati, (quia nec aliter virtus teneri potest,) semper beati sunt futuri, l. vii. c. 11. p. 680.

^h Perdetne suum præmium virtus? aut potius peribit ipsa? Minime. Sed & mercedem Deo judice accipiet, & vivet, & semper vigebit. Quæ si tollas, nihil potest in vita hominum tam inutile, tam stultum videri esse, quam virtus: cujus naturalis bonitas & honestas docere nos potest, animam non esse mortalem, divinumque illi a Deo præmium constitutum, l. v. c. 18. p. 515.

[†] Virtus autem sine ulla

intermissione perpetua est, nec discedere ab ea potest, qui eam semel cepit. — Ipsa ergo virtutis perpetuitas indicat, humanum animam, si virtutem ceperit, permanere. — Ergo præmium virtuti post mortem, l. vii. c. 10. Justitia vero & beneficentia tam immortales, quam mens & anima, quæ bonis operibus similitudinem Dei assequitur, &c. De Ira Dei. cap. ult. sub fin.

ⁱ In eo enim summa omnis & cardo religionis pietatisque versatur. Neque honor ullus deberi potest Deo, si nihil præstat colenti; nec ullus metus, si non irascitur non colenti. De Ira Dei, c. 6. Sive igitur gratiam Deo, sive iram, sive utrumque detraxeris, religionem tolli necesse est, &c. ib. c. 8. p. 780.

^k Si enim Deus nihil cuiquam boni tribuit: si colentis obsequio nullam gratiam refert: quid tam vanum, tam stultum, quam templa ædificare? — At enim naturam excellentem honorari oportet. Quis honos deberi potest nihil curanti & ingrato? De Ir. Dei. c. 8. Vid. & cap. 5. & not. i.

^l Nam quid

and

and zeal for religion and virtue, are without support and encouragement.

11.) It is, he thinks, agreeable^m to the divine beneficence, and other perfections, to reward virtue.

12.) Again: The^a sum, says he, of all we have said, is this: the world was therefore made, that we might be born. We therefore are born, that we might serve God our creator, and the creator of the whole world. We therefore know him, that we might worship him. We therefore worship him, that we may obtain immortality, as a recompence for all the labours and fatigues of religion and virtue in this world. And we therefore obtain the reward of immortality, that being made like unto the angels, we may for ever serve the God and Father of all. And if there are no rewards and punishments hereafter, man and the whole world would have been made in vain.

13.) Finally, 'Immortality,' he^o says, 'is the chief good. For obtaining this we were originally made. This human nature desires, and reaches after. And virtue advanceth us to it.'

13. Lactantius^p did not deny the eternity of hell-torments.

14. He often asserts the great value of repentance.

1.) He maintains, that^q whenever sinners repent, they are pardoned.

prodest, aut falsis religionibus liberari, aut intelligere veram? quid, aut vanitatem falsæ sapientiæ pervidere, aut quæ sit vera cognoscere? quid, inquam, prodest cœlestem illam justitiam defendere? quid, cum magnis difficultatibus cultum Dei tenere, quæ est summa virtus, nisi eum divinum præmium beatitudinis perpetuæ subsequatur? l. vii. c. 1. in. ^m Item plurimi quibus persuasum est Deo placere justitiam, — cum venerantur — Ergo est, propter quod Deus & debeat gratificari. Nam si nihil est, tam conveniens Deo, quam beneficentia: nihil autem tam alienum, quam ut sit ingratus, necesse est, ut officiis optimorum sanctæque viventium præstet aliquid, & vicem reddat, ne subeat ingrati culpam, quæ est etiam homini criminosa. De Ira Dei, c. 16. p. 805.

ⁿ Nunc totam orationem brevi circumscriptione signemus. Idecirco mundus factus est, ut nascamur. Ideo nascimur, ut agnoscamus factorem mundi ac nostri. Ideo agnoscimus, ut colamus. Ideo colimus, ut immortalitatem pro laborum mercede capiamus, quoniam maximis laboribus cultus Dei constat. Ideo præmio immortalitatis afficimur, ut similes angelis effecti summo patri ac domino in

perpetuum serviamus, & simus æternum Dei regnum. — Si nihil post mortem sumus, quid potest esse tam supervacuum, tam inane, tam vanum, quam humana res est, quam mundus ipse? l. vii. c. 6. in.

^o Unum est igitur summum bonum immortalitas: ad quam capiendam & formati a principio & nati sumus. Et hanc ad tendimus: hanc spectat humana natura: ad hanc nos provehit virtus, l. vii. c. 8. in.

^p — Si autem corpus vicerit animam, — sit in tenebris sempiternis & in morte. Cujus non ea vis est, ut injustas animas extinguat omnino, sed ut puniat in æternum. Eam pœnam secundam mortem nominamus, quæ est & ipsa perpetua, sicut & immortalitas. Primam sic definimus: — Mors est corporis animæque seductio. Secunda vero sic: Mors est æterni doloris perpassio. Vel ita: Mors est animarum pro meritis ad æterna supplicia damnatio, l. ii. c. 12. p. 206, 207. Vid. & l. vii. c. 10. p. 679.

^q — Nec patitur conditio fragilitatis, esse quemquam sine macula. Ultimum ergo remedium illud est, ut confugiamus ad poenitentiam: quæ non minimum locum inter virtutes habet, quia sui correctio est: ut cum re aut verbo lapsi fuerimus, statim re-

2.) Sincere

2.) Sincere ^r piety, repentance, humility, and confession of sins, he says, are propitiatory sacrifices, with which God is well pleased. Such worshippers God receives as his children, and will bestow upon them eternal life.

3.) He thinks it altogether strange, that ^r God should be disposed to punish, and not to pardon and reward.

4.) Inferior judges, he ^r says, may not be always able to pardon, when they are inclined to it. But it is the prerogative of the supreme Judge, to pardon, whenever he sees cause.

5.) If we, as he farther argues, are ^r reconciled to our rebellious children, with whom we had been greatly offended, upon their amendment; why should we make any doubt, whether God our Father may be appeased by repentance?

6.) The ^r divine displeasure against men, he thinks, ceases immediately upon their repentance and amendment.

7.) This ^r doctrine, he says, is taught by the holy and inspired prophets of God, though he forbears to allege them particularly. However, in another place, arguing upon this subject, he manifestly refers to Ezek. xxxiii. 12—16, and says, that ^r repentance intirely obliterates the iniquity, or guilt, of him who had sinned.

8.) All which arguments and reasonings of Lactantius seem to be founded upon the supposition, that, as he says, true ^r

spiscamus, ac nos deliquisse fateamur, oramusque a Deo veniam, quam pro sua misericordia non negabit nisi permanentibus in errore, &c. Epit. cap. 67. in.

^r Humilitas enim cara & amabilis Deo est, qui cum magis suscipiat peccatorem contentem, quam justum superbum, quanto magis justum suscipiet contentem, eumque in regnis cœlestibus faciet pro humilitate sublimem. Hæc sunt, quæ debet cultor Dei exhibere: hæ sunt victimæ, hoc sacrificium placabile, hic verus est cultus — Summa illa majestas hoc cultore lætatur: hunc ut filium suscipit, eique donum immortalitatis impertit. Ibid.

^r Primum illud nemo de Deo dixit unquam, irasci cum tantummodo, et gratia non moveri. De Ira Dei, c. 3. Vid. & c. 2. sub. fin. & Inst. l. 2. c. 17.

^r Judex peccati veniam dare non potest, quia voluntati servit alienæ: Deus autem potest, quia est legis suæ ipse disceptator & judex: quam cum poneret, non utique ademittit sibi omnem potestatem, sed habet ignoscendi licentiam. De Ira Dei, c. 19. ad fin.

^r Licet plane. Nam si liberos nostros, cum delictorum suorum cernimus pœnitere, correctos esse arbitramur, & ab-

dicatos rejeptosque rursus tamen suscipimus, fovemus, amplectimur; cur desperemus clementiam Dei patris pœnitendo posse placari? Inst. l. vi. cap. 24. sub in.

^r — Nam si prorsus immortalis fuisset ira ejus, not esset satisfactorius aut gratiæ post delictum locus. — Deus itaque non thure, non hostia, non pretiosis muneribus, — sed morum emendatione placatur: & qui peccare desinit, iram Dei mortalem facit. De Ira Dei, c. 21. in fin.

^r Prophetæ universi, divino spiritu pleni, nihil aliud, quam de gratia Dei erga justos, & de ira ejus adversus impios loquuntur. Ib. c. 22. ^r Sicut enim nihil prodest male viventi ante aetæ vitæ probitas, — ita nihil officiunt peccata vetera correcto, quia superveniens justitia labem vitæ prioris abolevit. l. vi. c. 24. p. 631. ^r Nihil enim sancta & singularis illa majestas aliud ab homine desiderat, quam solam innocentiam: quam si quis obtulerit Deo, satis religiose litavit. l. vi. c. 1. p. 539.

Sit humilis, misericors, beneficus, mitis, humanus — Ille homo sanus, ille justus, ille perfectus est. — Hic cultor est veri Dei. Ib. c. 24. p. 636.

Nulla igitur alia religio est vera, nisi

virtue

virtue alone recommends men to the divine acceptance: and that God desires nothing of men, but sincere virtue, or true holiness. Indeed, our author was ^b a great admirer of virtue, and has ^c most earnestly recommended the practice of it to Christians.

15. I think, we should not omit to take some notice of what Lactantius says of the ends and views of Christ's coming, and particularly of his death.

1.) God sent his Son, he says, to ^d call the Gentiles: however, without excluding the Jews. For he was first sent to them; and they rejecting him, he brought in the Gentiles to the privileges of the church of God. Again, Christ ^e was sent to teach all nations under heaven the knowledge and worship of the one only true God: to ^f convert men from vain and impious superstitions, to the knowledge and worship of the true God, and also from folly to wisdom, from sin to holiness.

2.) Righteousness ^g being in a manner lost in the earth, God sent this great messenger to instruct mortal men in the rules of righteousness: that he might be as a living law, to raise up a new name and temple, and spread true religion all over the world by his doctrine and example.

3.) Christ ^h came to be a teacher and a pattern of virtue; to teach righteousness and patience, not only by words, but also by deeds.

quæ virtute ac iustitia constat. Ib. c. 25. p. 639.

Quod si Deo patri ac domino hac assiduitate, hoc obsequio, hac devotione servierit, consummata & perfecta iustitia est: quam qui tenuerit, hic, ut ante testati sumus, Deo paruit, hic religioni atque suo officio satisfecit. Ib. c. 25. in fin.

^b Nec enim potest aliquid in rebus terrenis esse venerabile, cæloque dignum: sed sola est virtus, sola iustitia, quæ potest verum bonum, & cæleste, & perpetuum judicari, quia nec datur cuiquam, nec auferitur. I. iv. c. 16. p. 401.

Ut appareat, solam esse iustitiam, quæ vitam homini pariat æternam; & solum Deum, qui æternæ vitæ præmium largiatur. I. vii. c. 14. p. 692.

^c Nos tantummodo laboremus, ut ab hominibus nihil in nobis, nisi sola iustitia puniatur. Demus operam totis viribus, ut mereamur a Deo simul & ultionem passionis & præmium. I. v. c. 23. fin. Vid. & de Ira Dei, cap. ult. prop. fin.

^d Nec adjecit ulterius prophetas mittere ad populum contumacem, sed filium suum misit, ut gentes universas ad gratiam Dei convocaret. Nec illos ta-

men ab spe salutis exclusit. Epit. c. 43. Sed illum filium suum primogenitum delatari jussit e cælis, ut religionem sanctam Dei transferret ad gentes, doceretque iustitiam. Inst. I. iv. c. 11. p. 380.

^e Idcirco enim missus est a Deo pater, ut universis gentibus, quæ sub cælo sunt, singularis & veri Dei sanctum mysterium revelaret. I. iv. c. 12. p. 385.

^f Filium suum legavit ad homines, ut eos converteret ab impiis & vanis cultibus ad cognoscendum & colendum verum Deum: item, ut eorum mentes a stultitia ad sapientiam, ab iniquitate ad iustitiæ jura traduceret. I. iv. c. 14. p. 395.

^g Nam cum iustitia nulla esset in terra, doctorem misit, quasi vivam legem, ut nomen ac templum novum conderet, ut verum ac piæ cultum per omnem terram verbis & exemplo seminaret. I. iv. c. 25. sub in.

^h Summus igitur Deus, ac parens omnium, cum religionem transferre voluisset, doctorem iustitiæ misit e cælo, ut novis cultoribus novam legem in eo, vel per eum daret. Inst. I. iv. c. 13. in.

Jussit igitur eum summus pater descendere in terram, & humanum corpus induere; ut subiectus passionibus carnis, virtu-

4.) Christ died and rose again, to¹ assist men in overcoming death, and give them also hopes of rising again, and obtaining the reward of immortality.

5.) When ^{*} God determined to save man, he sent his Son, as a master of virtue, to teach the doctrine of righteousness, and to be an example of it, that men following him might obtain eternal life. He was also to deliver men from an excessive fear of death, and enable them to endure it with courage and patience. Christ lived in a mean condition, and underwent the ignominious death of the cross, that he might be a complete example of virtue, and of patience under sufferings: and that he might more especially lead and encourage such as are poor and mean in this¹ world.

6.) In a word, Christ came, and was made like unto man, lived, and died, and rose again, that he might clearly teach the precepts of virtue, and afford^m the best motives to the practice of it, and effectually help frail manⁿ to conquer the

tem ac patientiam non solum verbis, sed etiam factis doceret. Epit. c. 43.

Exemplis igitur opus est, ut ea, quæ præcipiuntur habeant firmitatem — Christus itaque, cum doctor virtutis ad homines mitteretur, utique ut doctrina ejus perfecta esset, & docere & facere debuerat, ib. c. 50.

Ergo, (ut cœperam dicere,) cum statuisset Deus doctorem virtutis mittere ad homines, renasci eum denuo in carne præcepit, & ipsi homini similem fieri, cui dux, & comes, & magister esset futurus. Inst. l. iv. c. 11. p. 382. Vid. ib. cap. 24.

ⁱ — ut esset necesse, appropriante sæculi termino, Dei filium descendere in terram: — veruntamen non in virtute angeli, — sed in figura hominis, & conditione mortali, ut cum magisterio sanctus fuisset, traderetur in manus impiorum, mortemque susciperet, ut ea quoque per virtutem domita resurgeret, & homini, quem induerat, — & spem vincendæ mortis afferret, & ad præmia immortalitatis admitteret, l. iv. c. 50. sub in.

^k Deus namque, sicut superius exposui, cum statuisset hominem liberare, magistrum virtutis legavit in terram: qui & præceptis salutaribus formaret homines ad innocentiam, & operibus factisque præsentibus justitiæ viam [f. viam] panderet, qua gradiens homo & doctorem suum sequens ad vitam æternam perveniret. Is igitur corporatus est, & veste carnis indutus, ut homini, ad quem docendum venerat, virtutis & exempla & incitamenta præberet. Sed cum in omni- bus vitæ officiis justitiæ specimen præbuisset,

ut doloris quoque patientiam, mortisque contemptum, quibus perfecta & consummata sit virtus, traderet homini, venit in manus impiæ nationis — sustinuit ergo cruciatus, & verbera; & spinas. Postremo etiam mortem suscipere non recusavit, ut homo illo duce catenatam mortem cum suis terroribus triumpharet — cur potissimum cruce? cur infami genere supplicii, quod etiam homine libero, quamvis nocente, videatur idignum? Primum, quod is, qui humilis advenerat, ut humilibus & infimis opem ferret, & omnibus spem salutis ostenderet, eo genere aficiendus fuit, quo humiles & infimi solent: ne quis esset omnino, qui eum non posset imitari. l. iv. c. 26. p. 435, 436.

^l Nam cum ad hoc missus esset, ut humillimis quibusque viam panderet ad salutem, se ipse humilem fecit, ut eos liberaret. Suscepit ergo id genus mortis, quod solet humilibus irrogari, ut omnibus facultas daretur imitandi. Epit. cap. 51.

^m Ut homini virtutis & exempla & incitamenta præberet. Vid. not. ^k.

ⁿ Ideo carne se induit, ut desiderii carnis edomitis doceret, non necessitatis esse peccare, sed propositi ac voluntatis. Una enim nobis & magna & præcipua cum carne luctatio est, cujus infinitæ cupiditates premunt animam — quibus [illecebris] ut repugnare possemus, Deus nobis viam superandæ carnis & aperuit & ostendit. Quæ virtus perfecta & omnibus numeris absoluta coronam vincens, & mercedem nobis immortalitatis impertit. l. iv. cap. 25. in fin.

desires

desires of the flesh, and the fears of present evil, and to overcome all the temptations of this life, and thus obtain a happy immortality.

So Lactantius.

16. As Christ came to spread true religion all over the world, so Lactantius does^o often bear testimony to the great progress which the Christian doctrine had then made.

And he particularly says, that^p there had been, and then were many Jews, who believed in Jesus.

17. He has very agreeably represented^a the fortitude and constancy of Christian people, not only of men, but of women and children likewise, under the greatest sufferings for their religion.

18. Lactantius has strenuously asserted the right of^r private judgment for every man in things of religion. And he openly calls upon all men to exert their intellectual powers in the search of truth, and to use their own reason about a matter of so great importance as religion, without relying upon the wisdom and understanding of other men, as if they had no reason of their own.

Mr. Mosheim^s has quoted that passage of our author with approbation, and thereby, as well as on many other accounts,

^o Denique nulla gens tam inhumana est, nulla regio tam remota, cui aut passio ejus aut sublimitas majestatis ignota sit, l. iv. c. 26. p. 437.

— cum omnes gentes & omnes linguæ nomen ejus venerantur, majestatem constituentur, doctrinam sequuntur, virtutem imitantur, l. iv. c. 12. sub fin.

Cum vero ab ortu solis usque ad occasum lex divina suscepta sit, & omnis sexus, omnis ætas, & gens, & regio unis ac paribus animis Deo serviant, l. v. c. 13. p. 494.

Debet eos suscipere defensionem deorum suorum, ne, si nostra invaluerint, (ut quotidie invalescunt) cum delubris ac ludibriis suis deserantur, l. v. c. 19. p. 518. Et passim.

^p Sed tamen—ad eos ipsos cum misit, —ut—& daret illis liberam facultatem sequendi Deum, —quod plurimi eorum faciunt atque fecerunt, l. iv. c. 11. sub fin.

^a Latrones & robusti corporis viri ejusmodi lacerationes perferre nequeunt: exclamant, & gemitus edunt. Vincuntur enim dolore, quia deest illis inspirata patientia. Nostri autem, ut de viris taceam, pueri & mulierculæ tortores suos taciti vincunt, & exprimere illis gemitum nec ignis potest. Eant Romani; & Mutio gloriantur aut Regulo:—Ecce sexus infirmus, & fragilis ætas,

dilacerari se toto corpore, utique perpetitur, non necessitate, quia licet vitare, si vellent: sed voluntate, quia confidunt Deo. Hæc est vera virtus. l. v. c. 13. p. 495, 496.

^r Quare oportet in ea re maxime, in qua vitæ ratio versatur, sibi quemque confidere, suoque judicio, ac propriis sensibus niti ad investigandam, & perpendendam veritatem, quam credentem alienis erroribus, decipi, tanquam ipsum rationis expertem. Dedit omnibus Deus pro virili portione sapientiam, ut & inaudita investigare possent, & audita perpendere. Nec quia nos illi tempore antecesserunt, sapientia quoque antecesserunt: quæ si omnibus æqualiter datur, occupari ab antecedentibus non potest. Illibabilis est, tanquam lux & claritas solis: quia, ut sol oculorum, sic sapientia lumen est cordis humani. Quare cum sapere, id est, veritatem quærere, omnibus sit innatum, sapientiam sibi adimunt, qui sine ullo judicio inventa majorum probant, & ab aliis pecudum more ducuntur. Sed hoc eos fallit, quod majorum nomine posito, non putant fieri posse, aut ut ipsi plus sapiant, quia minores vocantur: aut illi desipuerint, quia majores nominantur. Inst. l. ii. c. 7. init.

^s Abjicienda igitur triplex hæc servitus, mensque proflus in libertatem vin-

entitled himself to the respect and esteem of all lovers of liberty and good sense. This is very different from the sentiment of another celebrated modern, who^t forbids men the use of their reason in things of religion, and requires them to acquiesce in the church, and take her interpretations of scripture as divine: and censures Eusebius of Cæsarea in particular, for explaining scripture according to the best of his own judgment. Such is the precious liberty of a certain church! such her goodness, to rob us of our understandings, or at least to deny us the use of them! For if Eusebius, a bishop within three hundred years after our Lord's ascension, may not judge for himself, how vain must be all our pretensions to such a privilege! But why cannot we understand the scriptures as readily as the decisions of the church? And how came she to engross reason to herself, which, as Lactantius says, is given to every man for his direction and assistance, and is no more to be monopolized than the light of the sun? However, for certain, we have seen, that this doctrine of the church was unknown to Eusebius and Lactantius, the most learned men of their times, one among the Greeks, the other among the Latins.

19. Lactantius argues excellently against persecution.

1.) He esteems it the greatest absurdity that can be conceived, forⁿ any to impose on others a worship contrary to their conscience, or to deny men the liberty to choose their own religion.

2.) It is not, he says, zeal^x for religion, but a love of power, that makes men persecutors. For religion is the freest thing in the world; nor can it be promoted by force and vio-

dicandia. Cesset (1.) Hominum Studium, quos, licet sanctos, eximiosque, homines tamen fuisse recorderemur erroribus obnoxios. Pulchre & prorsus ad hanc rem accommodata Lactantius Divinarum Institutionum, l. ii. c. 7. Dedit omnibus Deus, &c. Jo. Laurent. Mosh. Institut. Hist. Christ. Majores in Præpar. v. 20. p. 23. Helmstad. 1739.

^t Cum quis eo devenit, ut fidei dogmata ex sui judicii arbitrio definiat, — nihil mirum, si frequenter aberret: omnia quippe sunt incerta, cum semel ab ecclesiæ statutis discessum est. Nam cum arcana deitatis & religionis, ab humano sensu remotissima, numen ipsum tradiderit, nonnisi ejusdem numinis ope & afflatu ea possunt explicari ac recte percipi. Ac cum uni ecclesiæ eandem rerum arbitrium Deus permiserit, ipsi soli eadem explananti se ad futurum pollicitus esset. Nihil itaque insolens est, si Eusebius, qui plerumque scrip-

turam & ecclesiæ dogmata ex sensu & opinione sua æstimare ausus est, in multis lapsus sit. Montfauc. Prælim. in Euseb. Comm. in Psalm. cap. 7. p. 29.

^u Quis enim tam insolens, tam elatus est, qui me vetet oculos in cælum tollere? Quis imponat mihi necessitatem vel colendi quod nolim, vel quod velim non colendi? Quid jam nobis ulterius relinquatur, si etiam hoc, quod voluntate fieri oportet, libido extorquet aliena? Inst. l. v. c. 13. p. 496. f.

^x Sed quis audiet? cum homines furiosi & impotentes minui dominationem suam putent, si sit aliquid in rebus humanis liberum. Atqui religio sola est, in qua libertas domicilium collocavit. Res est enim præter ceteras voluntaria. Nec imponi cuiquam necessitas potest, ut colat quod non vult. Potest aliquis forsitan simulare, non potest velle. Epit. cap. 54. Vid. ib. c. 55.

lence.

lence. Compulsion may make men hypocrites, but it cannot make them religious.

Tertullian had before spoken in the like^y manner.

3.) Such is the nature of religion, that^z it can be upheld by reason and persuasion only, not by power and authority. If you introduce force and violence, religion is destroyed; for without the free consent of the mind there can be no religion. By^a attempting to secure religion by force, you make what should be a school of virtue, a butchery, or place of execution. Truth and compulsion, religion and cruelty, are incompatible, and can have no fellowship with each other. The^b heathens therefore, he argues, as they were mistaken in religion itself, so likewise in the manner of defending it.

4.) It is, he says, a^c sign of a bad cause, to defend it by violence. If it were good in itself, reason and mildness would be the best means to secure it.

5.) If the^d gods are able, let them defend themselves. Methods of cruelty are unreasonable in all respects: they^e cannot be acceptable to the Deity, if he has any excellence. If^f such methods are approved by the gods, that alone is a sufficient reason, why they should not be worshipped. And^g they must

^y Nemo se ab invito coli vult, ne homo quidem. Apol. c. 24. Sed nec religionis est cogere religionem, quæ sponte suscipi debeat, non vi. Ad Scap. cap. 2.

^z Non est opus vi & injuria, quia religio cogi non potest. Verbis potius, quam verbibus, res agenda est, ut sit voluntas. Inst. l. v. c. 19. p. 518, &c.

^a Longe diversa sunt carnisficia & pietas. Nec potest aut veritas cum vi, aut justitia cum crudelitate conjungi. l. v. c. 18. p. 519.

^b Sed ut in ipsa religione, sic in defensionis genere falluntur. Defendenda enim religio est, non occidendo, sed moriendo: non sævitia, sed patientia: non scelere, sed fide: Nam si sanguine, si tormentis, si malo religionem defendere velis, jam non defendetur illa, sed polluetur, atque violabitur. Nihil est enim tam voluntarium, quam religio: in qua si animus sacrificantis aversus est, jam sublata, jam nulla est. l. v. cap. 20. p. 520.

^c Defendenda enim religio est, non occidendo, sed moriendo—non sævitia sed patientia. Illa enim malorum sunt, hæc bonorum. Et necesse est bonum in religione versari, non malum. Inst. l. v. c. 19. p. 520. Ex quo intelligi datur, quam non sit bonum deos colere: quoniam bono potius adducendi homines ad bonum fuerant,

non malo: sed quia illud malum est, etiam officium ejus bono caret. Ib. cap. 20. p. 525. Vid. & Epit. cap. 53.

^d Sed hæc se facere dicunt, ut deos suos defendant. Primum, si dii sunt, & habent aliquid potestatis, & numinis, defensione hominis patrocinioque non indigent, sed seipsos utique defendunt. Epit. c. 53. in.

^e Vellem scire, cum invitos adigunt ad sacrificium, quid secum habeant rationis, aut cui præstent, quod faciunt. Si diis: non est ille cultus, nec acceptabile sacrificium, quod sit ingratis. Ep. c. 53.

^f Libet igitur, ex his querere, cui potissimum præstare se putent, cogendo invitos ad sacrificium, Ipsius quos cogunt? —Cur ergo tam crudeliter vexant, cruciant, debilitant, si salvos volunt. —An vero diis præstent? At non est sacrificium quod exprimitur invito. —Si dii sunt isti, qui sic coluntur, vel propter hoc solum colendi non sunt, quod sic coli volunt: digni scilicet detestatione hominum, quibus lachrymis, cum gemitu, cum sanguine de membris omnibus fluente libatur. Inst. l. v. cap. 20. p. 524.

^g Si autem ipsis, quos cogunt: cur malo invitas? —Quæ stultitia est consulere velle nolenti? Cur pro beneficio imputes, quod mihi maleficium est. —Non est, [bonum,]

be disagreeable and offensive to those, on whom they are practised with pretence of good-will. For how can I esteem it a kindness, to be forced out of an opinion, which I took upon reason and choice?

6.) Lactantius likewise maintains, that ^a it is no just reason, why men should be persecuted, because they desert or oppose ancient and established religions. For there can be no prescription against truth; and every man has an unalienable right to search after truth, and to profess it, when he has acquired the knowledge of it.

7.) He vindicates Christians against the charge of obstinacy, as by other considerations, so ⁱ likewise by retorting upon their heathen adversaries and persecutors a charge of credulity and ignorance, cruelty and inhumanity.

8.) Though I have already transcribed from this author so much relating to this point, I know not how to forbear referring in the margin to a fine passage of his, concerning the universal equality of ^k mankind.

9.) He imputes the heathen persecutions not only to a love of power, as before seen, but likewise to the ^l apprehensions for the downfal of their own religion, occasioned by the vast and continual increase and progress of Christianity.

10.) But whatever they designed, Lactantius affirms, that ⁿ the Christians never were diminished by persecution; and that ⁿ the persecutions they endured, did many ways contribute

quod velis errori meo succurrere, quem judicio ac voluntate suscepi. Epit. cap. 53. sub fin. Et vid. su r. not. f. init.

^b Sed, recte ac merito puniri eos, aiunt, qui publicas religiones a majoribus traditas execrantur. Quid si majores illi stulti fuerunt in suscipiendis religionibus vanis, — Præscribetur nobis, quo minus vera & meliora sectemur? Cur nobis auferimus libertatem, & quasi addicti alienis servimus erroribus? Liceat sapere, liceat inquirere veritatem. Epit. cap. 55. init. At enim puniendi sunt, qui destruunt religiones, &c. Infl. l. v. c. 20 p. 525. ⁱ Sed

inhærentes persuasioni vulgari, libenter errant, & stultitiæ suæ favent. A quibus si persuasionis ejus rationem requiras, nullam possunt reddere, sed ad majorum judicia confugiant, quod illi sapientes fuerint, illi probaverint, illi scierint, quid esset optimum. — O mira & cæca dementia! In iis putatur mala mens esse, qui fidem servare conantur, in carnificibus autem bona. In iisne mala mens est, qui contra fas omne lacerantur? an potius in iis, qui ea

faciunt in corporibus innocentum, quæ nec sævissimi latrones, nec iracundissimi homines, nec immanissimi barbari aliquando fecerunt. Infl. l. v. c. 19. p. 517. ^k Equitatem dico, — se cum cæteris cœquandi, quam Cicero æquabilitatem vocat. Deus enim, qui homines generat & inspirat, omnes æquos, id est, pares, esse voluit: eandem conditionem vivendi omnibus posuit: omnes ad sapientiam genuit: omnibus immortalitatem spondidit. — Nemo apud Deum servus est, nemo dominus, l. v. c. 14. p. 501. ^l Cur enim tam crudeliter sæviant, nisi quia metuunt, ne in dies invalescente justitia, cum diis suis araneosis [al. cariosis. Vid. Heum. in loc.] relinquantur? Infl. l. v. c. 12. sub fin.

^m Cum autem noster numerus semper deorum cultoribus augeatur, nunquam vero ne in ipsa quidem persecutione minuat. — ib. c. 13. init. Et quoniam vi nihil possunt, (augeatur enim religio Dei, quanto magis premitur:) ratione potius & hortamentis agant, l. v. c. 19. p. 518.

ⁿ Nec cum videat vulgus, dilacerari ho-

to their increase. Many there were, who could not but dislike that religion, which inspired cruelty: some began to suspect, that there must be somewhat wrong in those sacrifices, to which men could not be compelled. And they were induced to inquire into those principles, for which great numbers of persons of all nations, of each sex, of every age and condition, chearfully underwent such grievous sufferings.

11.) Thus has Lactantius shewn, that compulsion is not acceptable, nor honourable to the Deity: that it is not a real kindness to those on whom it is exercised: that it is a sign of a bad cause, and contrary to the nature of religion, which is above all things free, and must be a man's own choice: and that it is impossible, that true religion should be served and advanced by force and violence. He likewise maintains, that antiquity and human authority can never amount to prescription against truth and freedom of inquiry.

12.) Indeed Lactantius has in his remaining works, particularly his Institutions and their Epitome, fully confuted every pretence for persecution. And if his book Of Persecution, mentioned by Jerom, were still in being, I persuade myself, we should have had some more fine thoughts upon this subject, which we now want.

20. Our author does likewise disclaim all persecution in the name of all Christians in general, as unworthy of the goodness of their cause.

1.) We^o do not desire, that men should worship our God, unless they are willing, though he be the Creator of the whole world. We teach, says^p he, we argue, we demonstrate; but we do not allure by worldly considerations: yet none leave us, being retained by the bands of truth and love. It^q is not by

hines variis tormentorum generibus, & inter fatigatos carnifices invictam tenere patientiam, existimant, id quod res est, nec consensum tam multorum, nec perseverantiam morientium vanam esse. — l. v. c. 13. p. 493. Et alia causa est, cur adversum nos persecutiones fieri sinat: ut populus Dei augeatur. Nec est difficile monstrare, cur, aut quomodo id fiat. Primum, fugantur a deorum cultibus plurimi, odio crudelitatis. Qui enim talia sacrificia non horreant? Deinde placet quibusdam virtus ac fides ipsa. Nonnulli suspicantur, deorum cultum non sine causa malum putari a tam multis hominibus, ut emori malint, quam id facere, quod alii faciunt, ut vivant. Alii

quod ad mortem usque defenditur; quod omnibus, quæ in hac vita jucunda sunt, & cara, præfertur. — Hæ tot causæ in unum collatæ magnam Deo multitudinem acquirunt. l. v. c. 22. ad fin.

o At nos contra, non expetimus, ut Deum nostrum, qui est omnium creator, velit, nolit, colat aliquis invitus: nec si non coluerit, irascimur. l. v. c. 20. p. 524. p Imitentur nos, ut rationem rei totius exponant. Non enim allicimus, ut ipsi obsecant, sed docemus, probamus, ostendimus. Itaque nemo a nobis retinetur invitus. Inutilis est enim Deo, qui devotione ac fide caret. Et tamen nemo discedit, ipsa veritate retinente. l. v. cap. 19. p. 519.

q Quæ omnia asseveratione propria, (nec

human authority, that things are decided among us, but by the word of God alone.

2.) This is glorious, when it can be truly said of the professors of any religion: and it ought by all means to be truly said of the professors of the true religion. It is likely, it may be said of those, who hold religion in its perfection and purity: for it may be argued, that wherever there is persecution, there some things are maintained, which are contrary to reason, and are no parts of true religion. Where therefore persecution is at a great height, there, very probably, religion is in a low estate.

IV. I must take some particular notice of errors ascribed to Lactantius. They are very ^r numerous. Gallæus has placed a large catalogue of them at the end of his edition.

1. Some have charged Lactantius with Manichæism. Several passages in his works are suspected of this error: some learned men are of opinion, that those passages are not genuine. For which reason, in late editions, they are generally placed at the bottom of the pages among the notes. In the edition of Gryphius, before-mentioned, those passages stand in the text; but they are marked with a small star before and after them. The learned Dr. Heumann in his notes upon one of those passages, declares himself in favour of their ^r genuineness. And I readily acquiesce in his judgment upon them: but I do not discern Manichæism in those passages, nor in any other part of Lactantius.

Dr. Heumann, the last editor of Lactantius, has renewed the charge of Manichæism against our author, which I wonder at. But the authority of so learned a writer will oblige me to speak to a point, which I once hoped to pass over with little or no notice.

Dr. Heumann says, that ^r Manichæism spread in Africa, the native country of Lactantius, and Augustine was once in that sentiment.

enim valet quicquam mortalis hominis auctoritas;) sed divinis aliquibus testimoniis confirmant, sicuti nos facinus. Ib. p. 518.

^r Tantus vero est eorum numerus, ut vix unquam alius scriptor tam sæpe in paucis libris errasse videatur. Aliqui enim centum & septuaginta illius errata olim numerabant, alii ea postmodum ad quatuor supra nonaginta, alii vero ad minorem numerum redegerunt. Nour. App. T. 2. p. 643. A.

^s Additamentum a Cellario hic subjectum in nullo bonorum codicum reperiri scribit Thomæus. Nec in ullis veterum meorum editionum id offendi. Tamen credo, Lac-

tantium ejus esse auctorem. Nec assentior Thomæo, qui profectum esse id putat a Manichæo quopiam. Nam primo nihil in hoc additamento docetur, quod non idem in superioribus docuerit Lactantius.

— Apparet hinc, castrationem, quam vocant, scriptorum ecclesiasticorum non esse rem novam; sed jam olim fuisse, qui quæ deteriora tenebrisque digna ipsis videbantur, inde rescindisse. Heuman. not. ad Inst. l. vii. c. 5. p. 627. Vid. ejusdem not. ad cap. 19. De Opif. Dei, p. 828.

^t Quo minus jam abhorreo a credendo, militasse Lactantium aliquando in castris

But Lactantius is almost a hundred years older than Augustine. It is likely, that Lactantius left Africa, before Manichæism had got any footing there. It cannot be shewn, that Manichæism was at all known in the Roman empire, till near the end of the third century: and then, it is probable, for some good while, had few followers. Lactantius, I apprehend, must have formed his sentiments, both in philosophy and divinity, before he could possibly be acquainted with that doctrine from Persia, if ever he was at all acquainted with it: which I very much question, for I cannot perceive in all his works any traces of such knowledge.

Moreover Lactantius expresseth himself differently upon all the peculiarities of that sect. He asserts ^a creation out of ^a nothing, and ^y that God made matter itself: which every one knows to be different from the Manichees, who held the eternity of matter. And he says, that ^a it is God alone, who is not made, or is eternal. His account likewise of ^a the formation of man, particularly, ^b the sexes, is intirely different from that of the Manichees. He scruples not to affirm, that ^c their strong propensities, and ardent affection for each other, are the constitution of divine providence. And he says, that ^d God

Manetis five Manichæi, frustra que consum-
fisse omnem operam Thomasi illum His-
panum in abstergenda ei hac labe. Vigebat
scilicet eo tempore hæc hæresis in Africa,
Lactantii patria, & Augustinus quoque ibi
aliquid hauserat ex hac disciplina. Heum.
in Præf. ad Lactant.

^a At si concipiat animo, quanta sit divini hujus operis
immetitas, cum antea nihil esset, tamen
virtute & consilio Dei ex nihilo esse con-
statam. Inst. l. i. c. 3. p. 14. Nemo
quærat, ex quibus ista materiis tam magna,
tam mirifica opera Deus fecerit. Omnia
enim fecit ex nihilo. Nec audiendi sunt
poetæ, qui aiunt chaos in principio fuisse.

—Quibus facile est respondere, potestatem
Dei non intelligentibus: quem cre-
dunt nihil efficere posse, nisi ex materia
subjacente ac parata, in quo errore etiam
philosophi fuerunt.—l. ii. c. 8. p. 179,
180.

^x Lactantius is reckoned by Beau-
sobre among those early Christian writers,
who taught creation out of nothing. See
Hist. de Manich. T. 2. p. 165. and 234.

^y Deus vero facit sibi ipse materiam,
quia potest.—Quid vero mirum, si fac-
turus mundum Deus, prius materiam, de
qua faceret, præparavit, & præparavit ex
eo, quod non erat? l. ii. c. 8. p. 182.
Materia vero semper fuisse non potest, quia
mutationem caperet, si fuisset, &c. lb. p.

184. in. ^a Solus igitur Deus est, qui
factus non est. l. ii. c. 8. p. 184.

^a Hominem finxit ex ipsa terra, quam
illi a principio in habitaculum præparavit,
id est, spiritum suum terreno corpore in-
duit & involvit. l. vii. c. 5. p. 663.

^b Cum ergo marem ad similitudinem
suam primum finxisset, tum etiam feminam
configuravit ad ipsius hominis effigiem: ut
duo inter se permixti sexus propagare sobo-
lem possent, & omnem terram multitudine
opplere. l. ii. c. 12. in. Vid. & cap. 10.
ib. & de Opif. Dei, cap. 10.

^c Cum
excogitasset Deus duorum sexuum rationem,
attribuit iis, ut se invicem appeterent, &
conjunctione gauderent.—Quæ cupiditas
& appetentia in homine vehementior &
acrior invenitur. l. vi. c. 23. p. 625. Sed
divina lex ita duos in matrimonium—
pari jure conjungit.—Nec aliam ob
causam Deus, cum cæteras animantes sus-
cepit sætu maribus repugnare voluisset,
solam omnium mulierem patientem viri
fecit: scilicet, ne feminis repugnantibus,
libido cogeret viros aliud appetere.—lb. p.
628. Ut libidinem producendæ sobolis
gratia dedit.—De Ira Dei, cap. 18. p. 813.

^d Deus ergo veri patris officio functus
est. Ipse corpus effinxit, ipse animam,
qua spiramus, infudit. Illius est totum,
quicquid sumus. Inst. l. ii. cap. 11. sub fin.

made

made soul and body, and that all we have is from him. Lactantius also says, that ^a God made the devil: who was at first good, but fell from perfection. The Manichees always and intirely rejected the Jewish scriptures of the Old Testament. But Lactantius heartily received them, and quotes them frequently, as will be seen hereafter. He calls them ^f sacred and divine: he considers their ^g prophets as men inspired by the one true God. He speaks of idolatry prevailing every where, except ^h with the Hebrews; among whom alone, he says, true religion was upheld for a long time. He calls the Jewish religion ⁱ divine. The Jews ^k he considers, as the ancestors of the Christians: and he believes, that ^l the Jewish prophets spake of Christ, and foretold many things concerning him. He ^m lays a vast stress upon the predictions of the prophets relating to Jesus. He also believes, that ⁿ Jesus Christ was clothed in flesh, and that ^o he was born, and ^p died: of Christ's humanity, and his ^q having all the sinless infirmities of the human nature, Lactantius speaks in the most expressive terms that can be used. All which things are contrary to the Mani-

^e Deinde fecit alterum, in quo indoles divinæ stirpis permanfit—suoque arbitrio, quod a Deo illi liberum datum fuerat, contrarium sibi nomen adscivit.—Hunc ergo ex bono per se malum effectum Græci *διασάδον* appellant. Inft. l. ii. c. 8. p. 178.

^f Salomonem, patremque ejus David, potentissimos reges fuisse.—etiam iis fortasse sit notum, qui divinas literas non attigerunt. l. iv. c. 8. p. 372.

^g Prophetæ—unum Deum prædicant: quippe qui unius Dei spiritu pleni. Inft. l. i. c. 4. p. 17. Vid. & l. iv. c. 5. & c. 11. in. & passim.

^h Nam cum primum scelerati atque impij Deorum cultus—irreperunt, tum penes solos Hebræos religio Dei mansit. Epit. c. 43. p. 111. edit. Davif.

ⁱ Iplius autem—posteri Hebræi dicti, penes quos religio Dei resedit, l. ii. c. 13. p. 214. Cum scpe Judæi—a divina lege desciscerent. l. iv. c. 11. in.

^k Majores nostri, qui erant principes Hebræorum, &c. l. iv. c. 10. p. 374. Nam cum posset populo suo & opes & regna largiri, sicut dederat ante Judæis, quorum nos successores ac posteri sumus;—iccirco eum voluit sub aliena ditione atque imperio degere, ne—in luxuriam laberetur,—sicut illi majores nostri.—l. v. c. 22. p. 522.

^l Hanc ergo dispensationem ne quis ignoret, docebimus, prædicta esse omnia, quæ in Christo videmus completa.—Quæ omnia cum probavero eorum ipsorum literis, qui Deum suam mortali corpore utentem vio-

laverunt.—l. iv. c. 10. p. 374.

^m Fecit, miracula. Magum putassemus, ut & vos nuncupatis, & Judæi tunc putaverunt, si non illa ipsa facturum Christum prophetæ omnes uno spiritu prædicassent. l. v. c. 3. p. 469. Vid. & Epit. c. 45.

ⁿ Is igitur coropratus est, & veste carnis indutus. l. iv. c. 26. p. 435. f.

^o—renasci eum in carne præcepit, & ipsi homini similem fieri, l. iv. c. 11. p. 382. In primis enim testificamur, illum bis esse natum, primum in spiritu, postea in carne, l. iv. c. 8. in. Descendens itaque de cælo sanctus ille spiritus Dei sanctam virginem, cujus utero se insinuaret, elegit. At illa divino spiritu hausto repleta, concepit, & sine ullo tactu viri repente virginis utero intumuit. l. iv. c. 12. p. 383. Vid. Epit. c. 43. in. & f. & c. 44.

^p Verumtamen non in virtute angeli,—sed in figura hominis & conditione mortali: ut, cum magisterio sanctus fuisset, traderet in manus impiorum, mortemque susceperet. l. iv. c. 10. in. Discant igitur homines & intelligant, quare Deus summus, cum legatum suum mitteret,—mortali voluerit eum carne indui, & cruciati affici, & morte muldari. l. iv. c. 25. Vid. & Epit. cap. 50. & passim.

^q—Sed si corpus hominis non induisset, non potuisset facere quæ docebat, id est, non irasci, non cupere divitias, non libidine inflammari, dolorem non timere, mortem contemnere, Epit. cap. 50.

chæan doctrine; as is well known to the learned, and may be perceived from the accounts formerly given of it.

Indeed, one can scarce forbear to suspect, that some learned men, who charge Lactantius with Manichæism, have not thoroughly informed themselves about the principles of that sect. For instance, some have said in their remarks upon one of the fore-mentioned suspected passages in Lactantius, that 'the writer teaches Manichæism, because he makes God to be the author both of good and evil. But allowing the writer not to have expressed himself exactly and properly upon that head, I presume, here is no Manichæism: for they held two eternal principles, one good, the other evil. And Lactantius always maintains, that 'there is one cause and origin of all things, even God: and opposes 'the doctrine of two eternal principles. I think, that 'Dr. Pfaff has well answered that objection.

Gallæus acquits Lactantius of this * error; partly, because Jerom, and other ancient writers, never say any thing of it; which appears to me a good reason: partly, because he thinks the passages before taken notice of to be spurious.

2. It is well known, that 'Lactantius did not believe, that there are antipodes. We of this time cannot but wonder, he should be so positive upon that head, and ridicule an opinion, which is now universally received, and was then known, and

* Neque etiam ullo modo admittenda, quippe quæ multos errores continet. Primo docet Manichæum errorem, nempe Deum creasse duo principia, unum boni, alterum mali. Vid. Gallæi not. in Lact. Inst. l. ii. c. 8. p. 179. Eadem fuit opinio Iſæi, qui in notis suis observat impium illud dogma nunquam alibi clarius adstrui. — In eo autem mortiferum aliquod Manichæorum virus versute & subtiliter insinuari, inde colligi potest, quod illius auctor aperte pronuntiat Deum fecisse bonum & malum. Nourr. App. T. ii. p. 638. E.

† Unus igitur est princeps & origo rerum Deus. De Ira Dei, c. xi. p. 794.

‡ Dua igitur constituuntur æterna, & quidem inter se contraria: quod fieri sine discordia & pernicie non potest. — Ergo fieri non potest, quin æterni natura sit simplex: ut inde omnia, velut ex fonte descenderint. Inst. l. ii. c. 8. p. 182, 183.

§ Quæ cum ita sint, non tamen vetustissimis hæreticis Manichæis, qui paulo ante tempora Lactantii nati sunt, annumerandus est Lactantius. Hi enim duo principia co-

æterna statuere, bonum & malum. Lactantius vero malum ab æterno non fuisse asserit, sed originem sumisse in tempore confirmat. Pfaff. Diss. Præl. n. 21. p. 27.

* Fuere, qui Manichæismi quoque Lactantium accusare non dubitarunt. Sed quia nec Hieronymus, nec quisquam alius veterum hunc in Lactantium errorem animadvertit: quia item vetusti codices non habent ea, &c. Gall. ap. Lact. p. 901. m.

† Quid illi, qui esse contrarios vestigiis nostris Antipodas putant? Num aliquid loquuntur? Aut est quisquam tam ineptus, qui credat, esse homines, quorum vestigia sint superiora, quam capita? aut ibi, quæ apud nos jacent, inversa pendere? fruges & arbores deorsum versus crescere? pluvias & nives & grandines sursum versus cadere in terram. Inst. l. iii. c. 24. in. De Antipodis quoque sine risu nec audiri, nec dici potest. Asseritur tamen, quasi aliquid serium, ut credamus esse homines, qui vestigiis nostris habent adversa vestigia. Epit. cap. 39.

proposed

proposed by some. Otherwise there had been no occasion to argue against it.

3. He went into the common notion of that time, concerning the fall of many of the ^a angels.

4. It is also well known, that ^a Lactantius expected a terrestrial reign of Christ for a thousand years before the general judgment. Jerom has ridiculed ^b his Millenarian notions, which are chiefly enlarged upon in the seventh and last book of the Divine Institutions. Jerom took the same freedom with Irenæus, Tertullian, Victorinus, and other Christian writers, who had the like sentiment.

This happy period our author thought to be very near, and that it could not be deferred ^c more than two hundred years.

5. Jerom has more than once remarked upon Lactantius, that ^d in his epistles, especially those to Demetrian, he denies the personality of the Holy Ghost: referring him, as the Jews erroneously do, to the Father or the Son. Jerom says, that ^e in his time this was a common opinion with many, who did not understand the scriptures.

6. In other places Jerom vindicates Lactantius from ^f an opinion concerning the origin of the soul, imputed to him by some.

7. Gallæus observes, that ^g Lactantius says little or nothing

^a Vid. Inst. l. ii. c. 14. Epit. c. 27.

^b Non quod ille regnum hoc terrenum fuerit adeptus, cujus capiendi nondum tempus advenit, sed quod cœleste & sempiternum. Inst. l. iv. c. 7. sub fin.

Nam cum ita sit a Deo constitutum, ut idem Christus bis adveniat in terram: semel, ut unum Deum gentibus nuntiet, deinde, rursus, ut regnet. l. iv. c. 12. p. 385.

Necesse est, ut in fine sexti millefimi anni malitia omnis aboleatur e terra, & regnet per annos mille justitia, sitque tranquillitas, & requies a laboribus. — l. vii. c. 14. p. 695. Vid. quæ ibidem sequuntur, & c. 15, 16, &c.

^c Neque enim juxta judaicas fabulas—gemmatam & auream de cœlo expectamus Jerusalem — Quod & multi nostrorum, & præcipue Tertulliani liber—de spe fidelium, — & Lactantii institutionum volumen septimum pollicetur, & Victorini Pitabionensis episcopi crebræ expositiones. Hieron. in Ezek. cap. 36. T. iii. p. 952.

^d Jam superius ostendi, completis annorum sex millibus mutationem istam fieri oportere, & jam propinquare summum illum conclusionis diem. — Quando tamen

compleatur hæc summa, docent ii, qui de temporibus scripserunt. — Qui licet variant, & aliquantum numeri eorum summa dissentiat, omnis tamen expectatio non amplius quam ducentorum videtur annorum. l. vii. c. 25. p. 726.

^e Lactantius in epistolis suis, & maxime in epistolis ad Demetrianum, Spiritus Sancti negat substantiam: & errore Judaico dicit eum vel ad Patrem referri, vel ad Filium, & sanctificationem utriusque personæ sub ejus nomine demonstrari. Hieron. ad Pamm. & Oc. ep. 41. al. 65. T. iv. p. 345.

^f Hoc ideo, quia multi per imperitiam scripturarum (quod & Firmianus in octavo ad Demetrianum epistolarum libro facit;) asserunt, Spiritum Sanctum sæpe Patrem, sæpe Filium nominari. Et cum perspicue in Trinitate credamus, tertiam personam asserentes, non substantiam ejus volunt esse, sed nomen. In Galat. c. iv. v. 6. p. 268.

^g Quantum memoria suggerit, nisi tamen fallor, nescio me legisse Lactantium ~~over~~ ^{respondere} animam dicere, &c. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. T. 4. p. 399. Conf. l. ii. p. 395. & l. iii. p. 465.

^h Quod de præcipuo Christo incarnati officio, sacerdotali nimi-

of Christ's priestly office. I do not remember, that Jerom has any where taken notice of this: but it is likely enough to be true; and that Lactantius did not consider Christ's death, in the modern way, as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, or a satisfaction made to divine justice for the sins of the human race. This may be argued from his passages before transcribed, concerning the value of repentance, and the ends of Christ's death.

But then many other ancient Christians will come in for their share in this charge. For according to Matthias Flacius Illyricus, in the preface to his *Clavis Scripturæ*, or Key to the Scriptures, 'The^a Christian writers, who lived soon after Christ and his apostles, discoursed like philosophers, of the law and its moral precepts, and of the nature of virtue and vice: but they were totally ignorant of man's natural corruption, and the mysteries of the gospel and Christ's benefits.' His countryman St. Jerom, he says, 'was wellⁱ skilled in the languages, and endeavoured to explain the scriptures by versions and commentaries. But after all he was able to do very little, being ignorant of the human disease, and of Christ the physician: and wanting both the key of scripture, and the lamb of God to open to him.'

The same Flacius, or some other learned writer of his time, in the preface to the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*, observes of Eusebius bishop of Cæsarea: 'That^k it is a very low and imperfect description, which he gives of a Christian; making him only a man, who by the knowledge of Christ and his

rum, tacuit: & ideo tantum Christum humanam naturam assumisse contendit, — ut universis gentibus, quæ sub cælo sunt, singularis & veri Dei sanctum mysterium revelaret, & unum illis Deum nunciaret. — Denique ut exempla virtutis homini præbere posset. Quæ omnia quam sint frigida, principe incarnationis Christi sine omisso, nemo non videt. Gall. Synth. Doct. Lact. p. 899. ^h Olim, mox post apostolos, plerique scriptores ad philosophicas de lege ac præceptis moralibus, & virtutibus virtutisque disputationes proruerunt: ignari prorsus nativæ corruptionis hominis, & evangelii mysteriorum, & beneficiorum Christi. M. Fl. Ill. in Pr. ad Clav. Scr. S. p. 7. f. ⁱ Unus popularis meus. Hieronymus, linguarum egregie peritus fuit: conatusque est sacras literas tum versionibus tum explicationibus illustrare. Sed revera & morbi humani, & medici Christi ignarus, destitutusque tum clave scripturarum aperiante, nempe dis-

crimine legis & evangelii, tum etiam apertore aut janitore ejus agno Dei, parum præstare potuit. Id. ib. p. 8. in.

^k Ut enim de aliis nihil dicamus, Eusebius certe Christianum hominem, l. i. c. 4. ita definit, ut si absit cognitio Christi, quam ei tamen, sed obscure, tribuit, prorsus videatur Ethnico more virum honestum, —describere. Ait enim, Christianum esse virum, qui per Christi cognitionem ac doctrinam, animi moderatione, & justitia, continentiaque vitæ, & virtutis fortitudine, ac pietatis confessione erga verum ac solum omnium Deum excellit. Ista primum nimis generaliter dicuntur. Deinde nihil de regeneratione. — Neque obscure significat, ad id tali homini notitiam Christi ejusque doctrinam solum prodesse, ut virtutibus possit excellere. Nihil de remissione peccatorum, atque imputata justitia per fidem in Christum dicit, quæ est quasi ipsissima Christiani hominis forma. In Præf. ad Hist. Eccl. Magdeb. p. 1.

' doctrine,

‘ doctrine, is brought to the worship of the one true God, and
 ‘ the practice of sobriety, righteousness, patience, and other
 ‘ virtues. But he has not a word about regeneration, or im-
 ‘ puted righteousness.’

Poor, ignorant primitive Christians! I wonder, how they could find the way to heaven! They lived near the times of Christ and his apostles. They highly valued, and diligently read the holy scriptures, and some wrote commentaries upon them; but yet, it seems, they knew little or nothing of their religion; though they embraced and professed it with the manifest hazard of all earthly good things, and many of them laid down their lives, rather than renounce it. Truly we of these times are very happy in our orthodoxy; but I wish, that we did more excel in those virtues, which they, and the scriptures likewise, I think, recommend, as the distinguishing properties of a Christian. And I am not a little apprehensive, that many things, which now make a fair shew among us, and in which we mightily pride ourselves, will in the end prove weeds only, on which the owner of the ground sets no value.

The early Christians, after the apostles, were not infallible. I do not represent them as such. They had their errors; but we should be sensible, that we also are liable to err. And possibly, they had in some respects a juster notion of true religion than we have. Grotius in his notes upon ¹ Rom. vii. 19. expresseth himself very differently from Flacius concerning the Christians of the first three centuries.

V. We saw in the preceding chapter one of ^m St. Jerom’s commendations of the works of Lactantius. And here, as we have gone along, we have observed his judgment upon several pieces in particular. In another place, that learned ancient speaks of our author in this manner: ‘ Lactantius ⁿ flows like
 ‘ a river of Tullian eloquence. I wish he had been as able to
 ‘ defend our religion, as to confute others.’ Apollinaris Sidonius likewise allows, Lactantius ^o to have had an excellent talent at confuting error. For certain, the former is the more difficult of the two: and it is agreeable to a well known saying of Cicero himself, who had so great strength and capacity of

¹ Deo laus sit, quod optimi, id est, trium primorum seculorum Christiani, hunc locum sic ut oportet intellexerint: dictante illo spiritu, per quem vita ipsorum dirigebatur. Grot. ad Rom. vii. 19.

^m See p. 1.

ⁿ Lactantius quasi

quidam fluvius eloquentiæ Tullianæ, utinam tam nostra affirmare potuisset quam facile aliena destruxit. Ad Paulin. Ep. 49. al. 13.

^o Instruit ut Hieronymus, destruit ut Lactantius, adstruit ut Augustinus. Sidon. Ep. l. iv. ep. 3. p. 9.

mind; 'I wish,' says he, 'I could as easily find out truth, as confute error.'

Trithemius says, that * Lactantius was well skilled in secular learning, and not a little conversant in the divine scriptures, and next to Cicero the most eloquent of all men.

It may not be amiss, to take some notice likewise of the judgments of moderns upon this writer.

Dr. Heumann, in his preface to his edition of the works of Lactantius, gives his character at large. He ^a was pious, learned, and eloquent. But there are observable in him several faults and defects. He was no critic, nor philosopher, and but a poor divine.

His want of critical skill is supposed to be ^a apparent from his quoting the Sibylline oracles, and works of Hydaspes, and Hermes Trismegistus, as genuine and authentic.

That he was a poor reasoner, and but an indifferent philosopher, is ^a inferred from his arguments against antipodes, and from his reasonings upon some other occasions.

Lastly, he ^a was a miserable divine. For he speaks differently from the sound doctrine of the church concerning the Trinity, and several other points.

Bull says, that ^a sometimes Lactantius speaks orthodoxly of the Son. This matter has been carefully examined by ^a Petavius, and ^y Nourry, to whom I refer.

However, Bull says, that ^a Lactantius had very little knowledge of the Christian doctrine. And it is very common for learned moderns to speak ^a in that manner of this writer, and

^p Nota Ciceronis vox est: Utinam tam facile vera invenire possem, quam falsa convincere. l. ii. c. 3. sub fin.

* — Vir in secularibus literis abundanter doctus, & in divinis scripturis notabiliter institutus, ita ut in arte dicendi post Ciceronem facile obtinuerit principatum. De Ser. Ec. cap. 56.

^q Virtutes ipsius tres cognovi, pietatem, variam doctrinam, eloquentiam: quarum prima vel sola commendare valet horum librorum lectionem. Apparebit certe cuivis lectori bono, vere pium, Christianaque virtute non tinctum, sed imbutum fuisse Lactantium. Heum. Pr. sub fin.

^r Tria item animadverti ejus vitia. Primum scilicet caruit facultate critica, acerrime ob id notatus a Thoma Reinesio in libro de Sibyllinis Oraculis. Id. ib.

^s Deinde permediocris fuit noster Lactantius philosophus. Equis hodie non rideat ejus de Antipodi-

bus disputationem. — ? ibid.

^t Postremo fatendum ingenue, fuisse Lactantium perminutum theologum. — Ne satis quidem perceperat ecclesie doctrinas: recteque sibi de Christo, de Trinitate, deque aliis rebus docere videbatur, cum multa traderet a sensu verae ecclesie alienissima. Ibid.

^u Nam Filium Dei unius esse cum Patre substantiae, unumque Deum totum Patris continere & capere, clare affirmat. En loca diserta. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. c. 14. n. 4. p. 152. al. 170. ^x Vid. Petav. Dogm. l. i. c. v. n. 6, 7.

^y App. T. ii. p. 779, &c. ^z Erat scriptor ille pene rudis disciplinae Christianae, & in rhetorica melius, quam in theologia versatus. Ib. p. 152. al. 170. Rhetor ille erat, non theologus, neque inter ecclesie doctores locum unquam obtinuit. ib. p. 218. al. 247.

^a See Mr. Warburton's Divine Legation, Vol. i. p. 3.

Arnobius.

Arnobius. Mr. Warburton says, 'that' though Lactantius 'knew but little of Christianity, yet he was exquisitely well 'skilled in the strong and weak side of philosophy.'

Lactantius had very different thoughts of himself; and reckoned, that he was able to defend truth, and particularly the true Christian religion, in such a manner, as to recommend it to learned and unlearned, and remove the difficulties and objections of both: as he intimates at the beginning of his *Divine Institutions*. And he intended that work, as 'a full and general answer to all, who already had, or ever should oppose the Christian doctrine.

Nor does it appear, that he was conceited of himself: but 'his confidence was founded in the goodness of his cause, which he thought to have such evidence of truth, that he could not but succeed in the defence of it. And when he wrote his book *Of the Workmanship of God*, one of his first performances in the service of religion, he supposed himself capable 'to instruct other Christians.

Mr. Warburton thinks, that 'Lactantius, when he confutes the established heathen religion, spares the priests; but in exposing their philosophy, he is not so tender of the sophists. Nevertheless, I do not perceive, that Lactantius had any regard for heathen priests. And I apprehend, he so concludes his second book, as to shew, that 'the philosophers of his time were reputed by him the most formidable adversaries, so far as they were respected, and were in the wrong. This seems to be the reason, why he argued so much against them.

^b As before, p. 394. Again: 'Lactantius having set up for a defender of 'Christianity.' p. 393. ^c — eaque [veritas] vel contemptui doctis est, quia idoneis assertoribus eget: vel odio indoctis, ob insitam sibi austeritatem — succurrendum esse his erroribus credidi: ut & docti ad veram sapientiam dirigantur, & indocti ad veram religionem, l. i. c. 1. p. 4.

^d Suscepi hoc opus, — non ut contra hos scriberem, qui paucis verbis obteri poterant: — sed ut omnes qui ubique idem operis efficiunt, aut effecerunt, uno semel impetu prosligare. l. v. c. 4. p. 470. Vid. & l. vi. c. 1. & l. vii. c. 1. ^e Verum ego non eloquentia, sed veritatis fiducia suscepi hoc opus, fortasse majus quam ut possit meis viribus sustineri: quod tamen, etiamsi ego defecerim, Deo, cujus est hoc munus, adjuvante, veritas ipsa complebit. &c. l. iii. c. 1. p. 234. Quod erat officium suscepti muneris, divino spiritu instruate,

ac suffragante ipsa veritate complevimus. l. vi. c. 1. in. ^f — apud quem [Demetrianum] nunc profiteor, nulla me necessitate, vel rei vel temporis, impediri, quo minus aliquid excudam, quo philosophi nostræ sectæ, quam tuemur, instructiores, doctioresque in posterum fiant. De Op. Dei, c. 1. sub in.

^g 'The eloquent Apologist — giving, in his *Divine Institutions*, the last stroke to expiring Paganism, where he confutes the national religion, spares, as much as possible, the priests: but in exposing their philosophy, is not so tender of their sophists. For these last having no public character, the state was not concerned to have them managed.' *Dedication of Div. Leg.* V. i. p. 30. ^h Peracta est igitur, ni fallor, magna est difficilis suscepti operis portio. — Nunc vero major nobis ac difficilior cum philosophis proposita luctatio est, l. ii. c. 19.

For a like reason Augustine, as he himself assures us, chiefly argued against the † Platonists.

Du Pin says, ' That † Lactantius is justly esteemed the Christian Cicero for his style, and greatly surpasseth him in his ' thoughts.' For certain, so it ought to be: this is honourable to the Christian religion. And I presume, that those learned moderns, who are pleased to depreciate Lactantius, as if he had little knowledge of the Christian religion, will allow as much. I shall here refer to a passage of our author, correcting a moral sentiment of Cicero; where that great heathen moralist and philosopher seems to say, ' We * should relieve ' deserving persons. And, says Lactantius, undeserving like- ' wise.'

Some have said, that Lactantius took delight in opposing Cicero. However, it was not because he had not a high esteem for Cicero, as is manifest; but rather, it is likely, because there was no other person so considerable: and † if he was mistaken, it was not to be expected, that any other heathen should have better notions.

Certainly Lactantius is to be respected upon many accounts. The time in which he lived secures him a kind of veneration. He saw the quiet and peaceful state of the church, before Dioclesian's persecution; he was also witness of that dreadful scene, and afterwards saw the flourishing condition of Christians under Constantine. His eminent abilities recommended him to the esteem of two great emperors, of different religions. His uncommon honesty and simplicity, and earnest zeal for the Christian religion, and all truth in general, appear in his works: where also his learning is very conspicuous. But we had seen more proofs of this, if his Epistles, and other works now lost, had come down to us. He had, as it seems, a certain vehemence and impetuosity of natural temper, not uncommon in Africans, which upon some occasions hindered his considering and weighing what might be said on both sides of a question. At the same time, possibly, we are indebted to

† Ideo quippe hos potissimum elegi, quorum de uno Deo qui fecit cælum & terram, quanto melius senserunt, tanto ceteris gloriosiores & illustriores habentur. De Civ. Dei, l. viii. c. 12. Elegimus enim Platonicos, omnium philosophorum merito nobilissimos. Ib. l. x. c. 1. n. 1.

‡ Il mérite à bon droit le nom de Cicéron Chrétien — Quoiqu' il soit, il est certain, que Lactance surpasse de beaucoup Cicéron pour les pensées, parceque les ma-

tières de la religion dont il traite sont infiniment au dessus des maximes de la doctrine des philosophes. Bib. T. i. p. 208.

* Et sæpe idoneis hominibus egentibus de re familiari impertiendum. Quid est idoneis? — Non enim idoneis hominibus largiendum est, sed, quantum potest, non idoneis, &c. l. vi. c. 11. p. 582.

† Eodem ductus errore Seneca. Quis enim veram viam teneret, errante Cicerone? l. iii. c. 15.

that fire, which supported him in the fatigues of acquiring knowledge, and then communicating it to others.

I have allowed myself to enlarge in the article of Lactantius, who, I think, must have been an honour and ornament to the Christian profession in his day; who employed his fine parts and extensive learning in the service of religion, without worldly views of any kind; whose works have had so many readers, and of which there have been so many editions, since the first discovery of the art of printing. It may be supposed, that a part of this writer's reputation is owing to the charms and beauties of his style: but the matter of his works is also a just recommendation. And indeed, if authors desire to be read, they should aim at perspicuity at least, if not also at some neatness and elegance of expression; and not rely altogether on the importance of their argument. Cicero himself, with all his fine sentiments, upon things of great consequence, and notwithstanding his high station in the Roman commonwealth, would scarce have been universally read and admired, if his style had been rough, obscure and perplexed.

VI. Lactantius, as formerly^m seen, blamed Cyprian for citing scripture in a work addressed to a heathen. But the fault which he imputes to Cyprian, I think, must be supposed to have consisted chiefly in quoting not only the Old, but likewise the New Testament, and thatⁿ expressly. For Lactantius himself in his Institutions, and elsewhere, openly appeals sometimes to the writings of the ancient prophets; and quotes the books of the Old Testament almost as freely, as he does Cicero, or Plato, or Hydaspes, or any other heathen author whatever.

1. We saw before, in part, this writer's regard for the Jewish scriptures, when we vindicated him from the charge of Manichæism. It is fit, that we should now shew it more distinctly, and likewise observe what notice he has taken of the scriptures of the New Testament.

1.) Lactantius says: 'All^o scripture is divided into two Testaments; that which preceded the coming and passion of the Lord, called the Old Testament, consisting of the law and the prophets; and that which has been written since the

^m See p. 18. ⁿ — loquente Domino & dicente: Ne dederitis sanctum canibus. — Cypr. ad Demetr. p. 185. Ipsum denique audi loquentem, ipsum voce divina instrumentem nos pariter & monentem: Dominum Deum tuum adorabis. Id. p. 137. ^o Verum scriptura omnis in duo testamenta divisa est. Illud, quod ad-

ventum Domini passionemque antecessit, id est, Lex & Prophetæ, vetus dicitur. Ea vero, quæ post resurrectionem ejus scripta sunt, novum testamentum nominatur. Judæi veteri utuntur, nos novo. Sed tamen diversa non sunt, quia nova veteris adimpletio est, & in utroque idem testator est Christus. Infr. l. iv. c. 20. p. 420.

^c resurrection

' resurrection of Christ, and is called the New Testament.
' The Jews use the Old, we the New: but they are not different; for the New is the accomplishment of the Old, and
' in both is the same testator, Christ.'

2.) Lactantius has expressly quoted many books of the Old Testament, and the Psalms and some others very often.

3.) He relates from the books of Moses^p the history of the creation, the fall of man, the flood, and likewise the history of the Jews, their going down into Egypt, and their return thence: and afterwards from the other books of the Old Testament, their government by judges, and then by kings, till the Babylonish captivity, as also their deliverance thence, and their return to their own land.

4.) Several books of Moses are^q expressly quoted by him, and ' the book of Joshua, and ' the books of the Kings. He quotes the book of Nehemiah by ' the title of Esdras: probably, because it was reckoned the second book of Esdras; or because what he quotes was supposed to be spoken by Esdras. See Nehem. ch. ix. particularly ver. 26.

5.) He often quotes the Psalms of David, and sometimes the Proverbs of Solomon. He likewise considers the book of Wisdom, as a writing of Solomon. I put in the margin^r passages, which shew these several particulars.

6.) Lactantius has quoted several of the prophets by name; as^s Isaiah, who was sawn asunder by the Jews, and^t Jeremiah, and^u Daniel.

^p Vid. Inft. l. ii. c. 9, 10—13. l. iv. c. 10.

^q Sed & ipse Moses—in Deuteronomio sic scriptum reliquit. Inft. l. iv. c. 17. p. 404. De qua tamen apertius ipse Moses in Deuteronomio ita prædicavit.—Idem rursus in Numeris, l. iv. c. 18. p. 413, 414. Item Moses in Numeris: Orietur stella ex Jacob. Epit. c. 44. fin. ^r Item Jesus Nave successor ejus. l. iv. c. 17. p. 405.

^s Item Helias in libro *Βασιλειαν* tertio. l. iv. c. 11. p. 380. Item in *Βασιλειαν* libro secundo, Propheta Nathan missus est ad David. ib. c. 13. p. 390.

^t Hefdras etiam propheta, qui fuit ejusdem Cyri temporibus, a quo Judæi sunt restituti, sic loquitur. l. iv. c. 11. p. 380.

^u Hunc prophetæ divino spiritu pleni prædicaverunt: quorum præcipue Salomon in libro Sapientiæ, item pater ejus cælestium scriptor hymnorum, ambo clarissimi reges, qui Trojani belli tempora clxxx. annis antecesserunt. Epit. c. 42.

Nam & David in principio Psalmorum suorum—beatum esse ait.—Et Salomon in libro Sapientiæ,—Inft. l. iv. c. 16. p. 401, 402.

Videlicet ipse est Dei filius, qui per Salomonem sapientissimum regem, divino spiritu plenum, locutus est ea quæ subjeci: Deus condidit me in initio viarum suarum. l. iv. c. 6. p. 365.

Salomonem, patremque ejus David, potentissimos reges fuisse, & eosdem prophetas, etiam iis fortasse sit notum, qui divinas literas non attigerunt, quorum alter.—Hujus pater divinatorum scriptor hymnorum in Psalmo xxxii. sic ait. l. iv. c. 8. p. 372.

^x Esaias enim, quem ipsi Judæi serra confectum crudelissime necaverunt, ita dicit. l. iv. c. 11. p. 381. ^y Dicit enim pheta Hieremias. ib. p. 379. & passim.

^z Daniel quoque similia prælocutus est. l. iv. c. 12. p. 385. Vid. ib. c. 21. sub in. & alibi.

7.) Citing Hosea, he calls him ^a the first of the twelve prophets; which shews, they were all received by him: And indeed divers others of them are quoted by him, as ^b Amos, ^c Micah, ^d Zechariah, whom he calls the last of the prophets, and ^e Malachi.

8.) What Lactantius says of Zechariah's being the last of the prophets, is an argument, that he did not receive any Jewish books, as canonical, which were written, or allowed to be written, after those of the twelve prophets.

9.) He often speaks very honourably of the Jewish prophets: the fourth chapter of the first book of the Institutions is all in their favour. He argues after this manner: 'That ^f they were not enthusiasts, nor yet impostors or deceivers, but sincere men, and real prophets, is manifest from the consistence of their discourses, from the actual accomplishment of their predictions, from the excellence of their doctrine, and their self-denying course of life. And some of them were kings and princes, who are not apt to be swayed by mean ends and views.'

10.) He says, the ^g prophets were inspired, and they taught the worship of one God only. Again, They were sent, that ^h they might teach men just sentiments concerning the divine glory and majesty. They ⁱ were also sent to reprove and reform mankind, and to ^k foretel things to come, particularly concerning the Christ: that when he appeared, men might believe in him.

^a Oseas quoque primus xii. prophetarum. l. iv. c. 19. p. 419.

^b Qua de re Amos propheta testatur, l. iv. c. 19. p. 416.

^c Micheas enim novam legem daturum, denuntiat. l. iv. c. 17. sub in.

^d Quare—etiam singulorum prophetarum tempora colligi possunt: quorum sane ultimus Zacharias fuit, quem constat, sub Dario rege secundo anno ejus, octavo mense, cecidisse. l. iv. c. 5. p. 361, 362.

^e Sicut Malachias propheta indicat dicens. l. iv. c. 11. p. 381.

^f Atqui impleta esse, implerique quotidie illorum vaticinia videmus. Et in unam sententiam congruens divinatio docet, non fuisse furiosos. Quis enim mentis emotæ, non modo futura præcinere, sed etiam coherentia loqui possit? Quid ab his tam longe alienum, quam ratio fallendi, cum ceteros ab omni fraude cohiberent? — Præterea voluntas fingendi ac mentiendi eorum est, qui opes appetunt, qui lucra desiderant: quæ res procul ab

illis sanctis viris abfuit. — Et hi non modo quæstum nullum habuerunt, sed etiam cruciatus, atque mortem. — Quid? quod aliqui eorum principes, aut etiam reges, fuerunt, in quos cadere suspicio cupiditatis ac fraudis non potest. l. i. c. 4.

^g Prophetæ, qui fuerunt admodum multi, unum Deum prædicant, unum loquuntur: quippe qui unius Dei spiritu pleni. — l. i. c. 4. in.

^h Idcirco enim a Deo mittebantur, ut præcones essent majestatis ejus, & correctores pravitatis humanæ. l. i. c. 4. in.

ⁱ Propterea Deus prophetas ad eos misit, divino spiritu adimpletos, qui illis peccata exprobrarent, & penitentiam indicerent. Epit. c. 43. Vid. & Infl. l. iv. c. 11. in.

^k Ideo prophetas ante præmisit, qui de adventu ejus prædicarent, ut, cum facta essent in eo quæcunque prædicata sunt, tunc ab hominibus & Dei Filius & Deus crederetur. Epit. cap. 49.

11.) He frequently asserts ¹ the antiquity of the Jewish prophets.

12.) He observes, that ^m the prophets often declare, in what kings reigns they lived and prophesied.

13.) He calls their scriptures ⁿ sacred and divine.

2. We are not, for the reason before hinted, to expect the like plain citations of the New Testament. Nevertheless, it may be discerned, that he received most of the books in that collection, as scripture, or writings of authority. But his reserved manner will oblige to a greater prolixity in making this out, than otherwise would have been necessary.

1.) In the passage produced not long ^o ago, we saw distinct mention made by him of the New, as well as the Old Testament.

2.) I would likewise here refer to, and transcribe in the margin, as a general passage concerning the New Testament, what Lactantius says of one of those persons, who at the beginning of Dioclesian's persecution wrote against the Christians. Lactantius informs us, 'that ^p this writer endeavoured to shew the falshood of the sacred scriptures, collecting out of them passages, which seemed to contradict each other; and that, such a number of them, that it might be suspected he had himself some time been a Christian.—But he especially abuses Peter and Paul, and the other disciples, as propagators of falshood: though as that writer says, they were ignorant and unlearned, and some of them earned their livelihood by fishing.'

It is plain, that Lactantius here speaks of Christian scriptures, or the books of the New Testament. But I say no more of this passage at present, because another opportunity may offer to take more particular notice of it.

¹ — quorum sane ultimus Zacharias fuit. — Quæ omnia eo profero, ut errorem suum sentiant, qui scripturam sanctam coarguere nituntur, tanquam novam & recens fictam. — I. iv. c. 5. sub in. Salomonem, patremque ejus David, potentissimos reges fuisse, & eisdem prophetas — quorum alter, qui posterius regnavit, Trojanæ urbis excidium centum & quadraginta annis antecessit. I. iv. c. 8. p. 372. Vid. Epit. c. 42. — initium facientes a propheta Moysæ, qui Trojanum bellum nongentis fere annis antecessit. I. iv. c. 5. p. 359.

^m Testati sunt enim, sub quo quisque rege divini spiritus fuerit passus instinctum. I. iv. c. 5. p. 359. ⁿ Sicut sacræ literæ docent. I. ii. c. 12. p. 210. quod divinis li-

teris proditum. ib. ut sacræ literæ docent. ib. p. 212. Vid. I. iv. c. 8. p. 372.

^o See p. 67.

^p Composuit enim libellos duos, non contra Christianos, — sed ad Christianos — in quibus ita falsitatem scripturæ sacræ arguere conatus est, tanquam sibi esset tota contraria. Nam quædam capita, quæ repugnare sibi videbantur, exposuit, adeo multa, adeo intima enumerans, ut aliquando ex eadem disciplina fuisse videatur. — Præcipue tamen Paulum, Petrumque laceravit, cæterosque discipulos, tanquam fallaciæ seminatores, quos eisdem tamen rudes & indoctos fuisse, testatus est. Nam quosdam eorum piscatorio artificio fecisse quæstum. I. v. c. 2.

3.) Lactantius relates our Saviour's conception^a in the womb of a virgin by the power of the Holy Ghost. And he applies to that event the words of Isa. vii. 14. both in his *Institutions*, and in his *Epitome*, as St. Matthew does, ch. i. 23.

4.) He seems also to refer to Matt. i. 21. in the *Epitome*, when he says, 'That' our Lord has among men two names, 'Jesus, which signifies Saviour, and Christ, which is the same' as King, or anointed. He is called Saviour, because he is 'health and salvation to all that through him believe in God.' He speaks to the like purpose in the 'Institutions.

5.) He relates our Lord's baptism by John in the river Jordan. Then, says 'he, was heard a voice from heaven, 'Thou

^a Descendens itaque de cælo sanctus ille spiritus Dei sanctam virginem, cujus utero se insinuaret, eligit. At illa divino spiritu haulto repleta concepit, & sine ullo attractu viri repente virginis uterus intumuit.—Item propheta Esaias cujus verba sunt hæc: Propter hoc dabit Deus ipse vobis signum, & vocabitis nomen ejus Emmanuel. l. iv. c. 12. p. 383.

Apud Esaiam sic: Ecce virgo accipiet in utero, & pariet filium, & vocabitis nomen ejus Emmanuel, quod significat nobiscum Deus. Epit. c. 44. p. 115. Ed. Davif.

Ab hominibus tamen duobus vocabulis nuncupatur, Jesus, quod est Salvator, & Christus, quod est Rex. Salvator idè, quia est sanatio & salus omnium, qui per eum credunt in Deum: Christus vero, &c. Epit. c. 42. in fin. p. 108. Vid. Davif. Not.

Jesus quippe inter homines nominatur. Nam Christus non proprium nomen est.—Erat Judæis ante præceptum, ut sacrum consecrarent unguentum, quo perungi possent ii, qui vocabantur ad sacerdotium, vel ad regnum, &c. l. iv. c. 7. p. 367.

Cum primum cepit adolescere, tinctus est a Joanne propheta in Jordane flumine.—Tunc vox audita de cælo est: Filius meus es tu, Ego hodie genui te.—Et descendit super eum Spiritus Dei, formatus in speciem columbæ candidæ. Exinde maximas virtutes cepit operari.—Quæ opera tam multa sunt, ut unus liber ad complectenda omnia satis non sit. Enumerabo igitur illa breviter, & generatim, sine ulla personarum ac locorum designatione.—Quod quacunque iter faceret, *ros, ac debiles, & omni morborum genere laborantes, uno verbo, unoque momento reddebant incolumes, adeo ut membris omnibus capti, receptis repente viribus roborati, ipsi leculos suos portabant, in quibus fuerant paulo ante delati:

Claudis vero, ac pedum vitio afflictis, non modo gradiendi, sed etiam currendi dabat facultatem. Tunc quorum cæca lumina in altissimis tenebris erant, eorum oculos in pristinum restituebat aspectum. Mutorum quoque linguas in eloquium, sermonemque solvebat. Item furdorum patefactis auribus insinuabat auditum. Pollutos, ac sparsos maculis, repurgabat. Et hæc omnia non manibus aut aliqua medela, sed verbo, ac jussione faciebat.—Nec satis fuit, quod vires imbecillis redderet, quod debilibus integritatem, quod agris & languentibus sanitatem, nisi etiam mortuos suscitaret, velut e somno solutos, ad vitamque revocaret. Quæ videntes tunc Judæi dæmonia fieri potentia arguebant: cum omnia sic factura, ut facta sunt, arcana illorum literæ continerent.—Ob hæc ejus virtutes, & opera divina, cum magnæ illum multitudines sequerentur vel debiliū, vel ægrorum, vel eorum qui curandos suos offerre cupiebant, ascendit in montem quandam desertum, ut ibi adoraret, ubi cum triduo moraretur, ac famæ populus laboraret, vocavit discipulos, quærens, quantos secum cibos gesserent. At illi, quinque panes & duos pisces se in pera habere, dixerunt. Afferri ea jussit, ac multitudinem per quinquagenos distributam discumbere. Quod cum discipuli facerent, frangebat ipse panem minutatim, carnemque piscium comminabat: & utraque in manibus augebatur. Et cum, apponi illa populo, discipulis imperasset, saturata sunt quinque hominum millia, & insuper duodecim cophini de residuis fragminibus impleti. Idem secessurus orandi gratia, sicut solebat, in montem, præcepit discipulis, ut naviculam sumerent, seque præcederent. At illi urgente jam vespere profecti contrario vento laborare cæperunt. Cumque jam medium fretum tenerent, tum pedibus mare ingressus

' *art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* And the Spirit of God descended upon him in the shape of a white dove. From that time he began to work great miracles; which are so many, that one book is not sufficient to contain them. I shall rehearse them,' says he, 'briefly, and in general, without names of persons, or places. In this enumeration of our Lord's miracles he mentions his healing all sorts of diseases by his word only, and immediately; that they carried their beds, who before were carried by others: that the blind were enabled by him to see, the deaf to hear, the dumb to speak, the lame to walk: that he healed those who were all over leprous, and also raised the dead, as out of a sleep: that the Jews, who saw these things, maliciously ascribed them to dæmons. [See Matt. xii. 24.] He particularly relates our Lord's feeding five thousand in a desert place with five loaves and two fishes; and that when all had been refreshed and satisfied, there were twelve baskets filled with the fragments that remained. He then relates our Lord's going up to a mountain, and ordering the disciples to take shipping, and go over to the other side of the sea before him. And says, that when they were in the midst of the sea, tossed with a tempest, Christ came to them, walking upon the sea, as upon dry land. And at another time, when he was asleep in the ship, and the wind was extremely boisterous, being awakened out of sleep, he quieted the winds and the waves, and there was a great calm.'

6.) Here he starts an objection. 'Perhaps' our sacred scriptures do not speak truth, when they ascribe to Jesus such power and command over the wind, the seas, and all kinds of diseases.'

This shews, that the gospels, from whence he takes the history of these facts, were esteemed sacred by him, and all Christians in general.

7.) Afterwards * he relates largely the history of our Lord's last sufferings: 'how he was betrayed by Judas, prosecuted

consecutus est eos, tanquam in solido gradiens. — Et rursus, cum obdormisset in navi, & ventus usque ad extremum periculum fervere cœpisset, excitatus e somno, silere ventum proutinus jussit, & fluctus, qui maximi ferebantur, conquietari: statimque sub verbo ejus tranquillitas infecuta est. Inst. l. iv. c. 15. p. 395, 396, 397, 398, 399.

* Mentiuntur fortasse literæ sanctæ, docentes, tantam fuisse in eo potestatem, ut imperio suo cogeret ventos obse-

qui, maria servire, morbos cedere, inferos obedire. ib. p. 399.

* Quod cum sciret futurum, & subinde diceret, oportere se pati ac interfici pro salute multorum, secessit tamen cum discipulis suis. — Itaque Judas præmio illectus tradidit eum judæis. At illi comprehensum, ac Pontio Pilato — oblatum, cruci affigi postulaverunt. — Duxerunt ergo eum flagellis verberatum, &, priusquam cruci affigerent, illuserunt. Indutum enim coloris punice-

‘ before Pilate, and condemned : how he was mocked and derided, being struck with the palm of the hands, spit on, arrayed with a scarlet robe, and a crown of thorns, and then crucified between two robbers. And that ^y as he hung on the cross, he cried with a loud voice, and resigned his spirit. And likewise, that at the same time there was an earthquake, and the vail of the temple was rent : the sun also was eclipsed, and there was darkness from the sixth to the ninth hour. Finally ^z he proceeds to relate our Lord’s burial, and the military guard at the sepulchre, and his resurrection on the third day, as he had foretold.’

8.) Of all these things he speaks again summarily in the Epitome. And in another chapter of the ^b Institutions he mentions many of our Lord’s miracles.

9.) That whole history just transcribed, is plainly taken from our gospels. And though, perhaps, it is not so easy to distinguish references to St. Mark’s gospel, as to the other three, yet I suppose most will allow, that here is good proof of his receiving our four gospels, as authentic histories of Jesus Christ.

10.) In the Epitome he seems to allude to the parable of the pharisee and the publican, which we have in Luke xviii. 9—14. ‘ For humility,’ says he, ‘ is dear and acceptable to God. And if he rather accepts a confessing sinner, than a proud righteous man ; how much more will he approve a righteous man, who confesseth his failings, and exalt him in his heavenly kingdom for his humility !’

veste, ac spinis coronatum, quasi regem salutarerunt, & dederunt ei cibum felleis, & miscuerunt ei acceti potionem. Post hæc conspuerunt in faciem ejus, & palmis ceciderunt. Cumque ipsi carnifices de vestimentis ejus contenderent, sortiti sunt inter se de tunica & pallio.—Tum suspende-
runt eum inter duos noxios medium, qui ob latrocinia damnati erant, crucique affixe-
runt. ib. c. 18. p. 407, 408, 409, 410.

^y Suspendus igitur atque affixus exclamavit ad Dominum voce magna, & ultro spiritum posuit. Et eadem hora terræ motus factus est, & velum templi, quod separabat duo tabernacula, scissum est in duas partes, & sol repente subductus est, & ab hora sexta usque in nonam tenebræ fuerunt. c. 19. p. 415. ^z Sed quoniam prædixerat, se tertio die ab inferis resurrecturum, metuentes, ne a discipulis surrepto & amoto cor-

pore, universi resurrexisse eum crederent, & fieret multo major in plebe confusio; detraxerunt eum cruci, & conclusum in monumento firmiter militari custodia circumdederunt. Verum tertio die ante lucem terræ motu facto, repente patefactum est sepulchrum, & custodibus, quos attonitos obstupefecerat pavor, nihil videntibus, integer, sepulchro ac vivus egressus,—in sepulchro vero nihil repertum est, nisi exuviae, quibus involutum corpus incluserant. ib. c. 19. p. 417. ^a Epit. c. 45, 46, 47.

^b l. iv. c. 26. ^c Humilitas enim cara & amabilis Deo est, qui cum magis suscipiat peccatorem confitentem, quam justum superbum; quanto magis justum suscipiet confitentem, eumque in regnis cælestibus faciet pro humilitate sublimem. Epit. c. 17.

11.) He

11.) He likewise says, ' that ^d God has commanded us, ' when we make a feast, to invite such as cannot invite us ' again, and make us a recompense: ' referring, I think, to Luke xiv. 12.

12.) He must be allowed now and then to use expressions allusive to the gospels. He speaks of ^e having the mind, or heart in heaven. Compare Matt. vi. 21. Again: ' That ^f we ' may be able to do all these things, we must despise riches, ' and lay up to ourselves heavenly treasures, where no thief ' may break through, nor rust corrupt, nor tyrant plunder.' See Matt. vi. 19, 20.

13.) He may be reckoned likewise to refer to ^g what is in Matt. v. 27—32.

14.) I believe, few can make any doubt, but he has an eye to what is in ^h Luke vi. 35. and ⁱ Luke xvi. 25. and ^j Matt. vi. 1—4. and ^k Matt. xix 10, 11, 12.

15.) St. John's gospel is expressly quoted by him in this manner: ' So also ^l John declares, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made.*' John i. 1, 2, 3. which ^m last words are also in the Epitome.

16.) He refers to John ii. 20. where ⁿ the Jews speak of their temple having been forty and six years in building. Compare Mark xiv. 58.

^a Idem Deus præcepit, ut si quando cetnam paraverimus, eos in convivium adhibeamus, qui revocare non possunt, & vicem reddere, &c. l. vi. c. 12. p. 585.

^c Quisquis enim aut Deum colendum esse intelligit, aut immortalitatis spem sibi propositam habet, mens ejus in cælo est. l. iii. c. 27. p. 333.

^f Ergo, ut hæc omnia, quæ Deo placent facere possimus, contemnenda est pecunia, & ad cælestes transferenda thesauros, ubi nec fur effodiat, nec rubigo consumat, nec tyrannus eripiat. Epit. cap. 65.

^g — addantur & illa, — adulterum esse, qui a marito dimissam duxerit, & cum, qui præter crimen adulterii uxorem dimiserit, ut alteram ducat. — Præterea non tantum adulterium esse vitandum, sed etiam cogitationem: ne quis adspiciat alienam & animo concupiscat. Adulteram enim fieri mentem, si — l. vi. c. 23. p. 630. Vid. & Epit. c. 66.

^h Id enim iuste, id pie, id humane sit, quod spe recipiendi feceris. l. vi. c. 11. p. 589.

ⁱ Quia jam bonis, quæ malue-

runt, potius sunt. l. vii. c. 11. in.

^k Nec tamen, si quid boni fecerimus, gloriam captemus ex eo. Monet enim Deus operatorem justitiæ non oportere esse jactantem, ne non — habeatque jam pretium gloriæ, quod captavit, nec præmium cælestis illius ac divinæ mercedis accipiat. l. vi. c. 18. sub fin. ^j Quod quidem Deus non ita fieri præcepit, tanquam adstringat. — Si quis hoc, inquit, facere potuerit, habebit eximiam, incomparabilemque mercedem. l. vi. c. 23. p. 630.

^l Joannes quoque ita tradidit: In principio erat Verbum, & Verbum erat apud Deum, & Deus erat Verbum. Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, & sine ipso factum est nihil. l. iv. c. 8. f. ^m — solus Deus nuncupatus. Omnia enim per ipsum, & sine ipso nihil. Epit. c. 42.

ⁿ Item, quod dixerat. Si solveritis hoc templum, quod ædificatum est annis 46. ego illud in triduo sine manibus suscitabo. l. iv. c. 18. p. 408.

17.) He

17.) He observes, that ° the *Father loveth the Son, and giveth him all things*: referring, it is likely, to John iii. 35. and ch. v. 20. And that the Father and the Son are one, referring, probably, to John x. 30. I have transcribed the passage at the bottom of the page.

18.) He plainly has an eye to those places in St. John's gospel, where ° Christ speaks of his having power to lay down his life, and to take it up again. See particularly John x. 18.

19.) It is not unlikely, that he refers to the history of our Lord's raising Lazarus in John xi. when he says, that ° Christ raised some from death, calling them by name. See ver. 43.

3. I apprehend, there is good reason to think, that Lactantius received and made use of the book of the Acts. But since he has not expressly quoted it, I am obliged to transcribe several passages, that my readers may judge for themselves.

1.) He says, ' that ' after his resurrection, Christ having ' given commandment to his disciples, concerning preaching ' the gospel, on a sudden a cloud surrounded him, and carried ' him up to heaven on the fortieth day of his passion.' See Acts i. 3—9.

2.) The like to which comes over again in the abridgment of the Institutions, and is there expressed in this manner: ' Going ' therefore into Galilee, after his resurrection, he again ' gathered together his disciples, whom fear had separated, ' and having given commandment concerning the things to be ' observed by them, and appointed, that the gospel should be ' preached all over the world, he breathed into them the Holy ' Ghost, [see John xx. 22.] and gave them power to work ' miracles, that they might promote the salvation of men by ' their works, as well as by their words. And at length on ' the fiftieth day he returned to the Father, being taken up in ' a cloud.'

• Qui Filium non agnovit, nec Patrem potuit agnoscere. — Nec tamen sic habendum est, tanquam duo sint Dii. — Pater enim ac Filius unum sunt. Cum enim Pater Filium diligat, omniaque ei tribuat, & Filius fideliter obsequatur, nec velit quidquam, nisi quod Pater, & quæ sequuntur. Epit. c. 49.

p Nec hoc cuiquam ignorandum est, quod ipse ante de sua passione prædicans, etiam id notum fecerit, habere se potestatem, cum vellet, deponendi spiritum, & resumendi. l. iv. c. 26. p. 437.

q Jacentia mortuorum corpora crexit, eosque nominibus suis inclamatos a morte revocavit. l. iv. c. 26. p.

434.

* Ordinato vero discipulis suis evangelio, ac nominis sui prædicatione, circumfudit se repente nubes, eumque in cælum sustulit, quadragesimo post passionem die. l. iv. c. 21. in.

* Profectus igitur in Galilæam post resurrectionem, discipulos suos rursus, quos metus in fugam verterat, congregavit, datisque mandatis, quæ observari vellet, & ordinata evangelii prædicatione per totum orbem inspiravit in eos spiritum sanctum, ac dedit eis potestatem miracula faciendi, ut in salutem hominum tam factis, quam verbis operarentur. Ac tum demum quinquagesimo die remeavit ad Patrem, sublatus in nubem. Epit. c. 47.

Here

Here Lactantius says the fiftieth day. Dr. Davies in his notes upon the place says, it should be the fortieth day, and that the number fifty is owing to the fault of the transcriber. There is the more reason, he says, to think so, because in the parallel place in the Institutions, before cited, is forty days, agreeably to Acts i. 3.

3.) In Acts ii. 27. St. Peter, speaking of our Lord's resurrection, quotes words out of the xvith Psalm, which he applies to that event, as does Lactantius likewise in his ¹ Institutions, and ² Epitome.

4.) St. Paul says, Acts xiii. 27. *For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets, which are read every sabbath-day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.* Lactantius several times ³ expresseth himself, as if had an eye to this text.

5.) He may be supposed to refer to ⁴ St. Paul's argument at Athens, which is in Acts xvii.

6.) In Acts xiv. 22. Paul and Barnabas teach the disciples, that *we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God.* To this text it may be thought, that ⁵ Lactantius refers, unless he has an eye to 2 Tim. iii. 12. *Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.*

4. There are not in Lactantius many clear allusions, or particular references to epistles of apostles.

1.) It may be argued however, that he was acquainted with the Acts, and the epistles of the apostles, from ⁶ the clear

¹ Illam autem apud inferos non reman-
surum, sed die tertio resurrecturum, pro-
pheta cecinerant. David in Psalmo xvi.
Non derelinques animam meam apud inferos,
nec dabis sanctum tuum videre interitum.
I. iv. c. 19. p. 418.

² Ipsum vero resurrecturum die tertio jam olim propheta fuerant prolocuti. David in Psalmo xvi. Non derelinques animam meam ad inferos, nec dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem. Epit. c. 47.

³ Sicut etiam voces prophetarum, quæ cum — lectæ fuissent a populo Judæorum, nec tamen intellectæ sunt, — I. iv. c. 15. fin.

Cum igitur ea, quæ Deus fieri voluit, quæ per prophetas suos multis sæculis ante prædixit, Christus impleveret, ob ea incitati, & divinas literas nescientes, coiverunt, ut Deum suum condemnarent. ib. c. 18. in.

Quid amplius jam de facinoribus Judæorum dici potest, quam, excecatos tum fuisse, atque insanabili furore correptos, qui

hæc quotidie legentes neque intellexerunt, neque quin facerent, cavere potuerunt. ib. c. 19. in.

Harum literarum igitur immemores, quas legebant, &c. Epit. c. 45.

⁴ Non ergo utitur his omnibus, quæ templis, diisque fœdibus inferuntur. —

Illis autem, quæ in usum tribuit homini Deus, ipse non indiget, — non indiget templo, non indiget simulachro. Epit. c. 58. — per illum vivimus, per illum in hospitium hujus mundi intravimus — in hujus domo habitamus, hujus familia sumus.

— De Ira Dei, c. 23. p. 824, 825.

⁵ — & postea universos, qui eorum disciplinam secuti essent, acerba & nefanda passuros. I. v. c. 3. p. 464. Quæ omnia tolerare ac perpeti necesse est eos, qui veritatem sequuntur. I. iv. c. 26. p. 435.

⁶ Exhæredatos autem esse Judæos, quia Christum reprobaverunt, & nos, qui sumus ex gentibus, in eorum locum adoptatos, scripturis adprobatur. Jeremias ita dicit.

manner in which he speaks of the rejection of the Jews, and the call of the Gentiles under the gospel. But he quotes only the prophets of the Old Testament, when he speaks of this matter.

2.) Lactantius often speaks of ^b Christ's coming again to judge the quick and the dead. But that being mentioned in several books of the New Testament, we cannot say, to which book, or what text, he particularly refers.

3.) Speaking of good actions, he says: 'These ^d are works, these are offices of compassion, which if a man performs, he offers a true and acceptable sacrifice to God.' Perhaps he refers to Rom. xii. 1, 2.

4.) In another place he may be supposed to have an eye to the prudent and generous conduct, recommended in Rom. xii. 14. and 18—21.

5.) He says, 'The divine scriptures ^f assure us, that the thoughts of philosophers are foolish: ^g and ^h that philosophy is foolishness with God.' St. Paul says, 1 Cor. i. 20. *Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?* and ch. iii. 19, 20. *For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.*—And again, *the Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.* Which last words are a quotation from Psal. xciv. 11. And compare Col. ii. 8.

6.) It is likely, that he refers to 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. in words which I put in the ^h margin.

7.) He says, 'that ⁱ Christ sits at the right-hand of God, and will subdue his enemies under his feet.' A like expression is in 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25. and also in Heb. x. 12, 13. *But this man—sat down on the right-hand of God: from thenceforth expecting, till his enemies be made his footstool.*

—Malachias, —Esaïas quoque. Epit. c. 48. Si ergo Judæi a Deo rejecti sunt, sicut sacrarum scripturarum fides indicat; gentes autem, sicut videmus, adscitæ, ac de tenebris hujus vitæ secularis, deque vinculis dæmonum liberatæ.—ib. c. 49. in. Conf. Instit. l. iv. c. 20.

^b Ultimis enim temporibus statuit de vivis ac mortuis judicare. l. ii. c. 17. sub in. Veniet ergo summi ac maximi Dei filius, ut vivos ac mortuos judicet. l. vii. c. 24. in.

^c Acts x. 42. 2 Tim. iv. 1. 1 Pet. iv. 5.

^d Hæc sunt opera, hæc officia misericordiæ, quæ si quis obierit, verum & acceptum sacrificium Deo immolabit. Hæc litabilior victima est apud Deum, qui non pecudis sanguine, sed hominis pietate placatur. Epit. c. 65.

^e —Male dicenti bene dicto respondeat.—Quin etiam ca-

veat diligenter, ne quando inimicum sua culpa faciat. Et si quis exsisterit tam protervus, qui bono & iusto faciat injuriam; clementer & moderate seret, & ultionem suam non sibi assumat, sed judicio Dei reservet. l. vi. c. 18. p. 609.

^f Cum enim sit nobis divinis literis traditum, cogitationes philosophorum stultas esse. l. iii. c. 1. p. 235.

^g —terrena, & de terra ficta continent. Philosophiam, quæ apud Deum stultitia est, pro nihilo computent. Epit. c. 38.

^h Hujus præmii cælestis ac sempiterni participes esse non possunt, qui fraudibus, rapinis, circumscriptionibus conscientiam suam polluerunt, &c. De Ira Dei, c. 23. sub fin.

ⁱ Cum igitur ad dexteram Dei sedeat, calcaturus inimicos, qui eum cruciaverunt.—Epit. c. 48. in.

8.) He

8.) He seems to refer to ^k the exhortation in Gal. vi. 2. *Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.*

9.) I suppose, no one will hesitate to allow, that he refers to Eph. iv. 26. when he says: 'God ^l has enjoined us, not to let the sun go down upon our wrath.'

10.) He says, 'that ^m a good man, following the instructions of the gospel, will not be bitter toward his child, or his servant; knowing, that he also has a father and a master.' It is likely, that here is a reference to the admonitions in Eph. vi. 4—9. and Col. iii. 21, 22, 24. and iv. 1.

11. Perhaps he refers to Philip. ii. 6—9. when he says, 'that ⁿ Christ being sent to open the way of salvation to the meanest, he humbled himself, that he might help them. He therefore underwent that kind of death, which is wont to be inflicted on mean people, that all might be able to imitate him. Hence also he was highly exalted.'

12.) Perhaps, among other plain references to several things in the Revelation, he may refer to ^o 2 Thess. ii. 4. 9.

13. Lactantius has some observations and arguments, which are also in the epistle to the Hebrews. Whether he borrowed them thence, is not easy to say.

14.) In one place he argues after this manner: 'From ^p which reasons it appears, that all the prophets declared concerning Christ, that the time would come, when being as to the body born of the seed of David, he should erect an eternal temple to God, which is called his church, and

^k Nos ergo, — quibus solis a Deo veritas revelata, & cælitus missa sapientia est, faciamus, quæ jubet illuminator noster Deus: suslineamus invicem. l. vi. c. 18. prop. in.

^l Præcepit Deus, non occidere solum super iram nostram. l. vi. c. 18. sub fin. Non igitur in totum prohibet irasci: — sed prohibet in ira permanere. — Deinde rursus, cum irasci quidem, sed tamen non peccare, præcepit, non utique evellit iram radicibus, sed temperavit. Cum ille homines ante solis occasum reconciliari jubeat. De Ira Dei, c. 21. p. 819.

^m Non sit asper in filium, neque in servum. Meminerit, quod & ipse patrem habeat & dominum. Epit. c. 64.

ⁿ Nam cum ad hoc missus esse, ut humillimis quibusque viam panderet ad salutem, se ipse humilem fecit, ut eos liberaret. Suscepit ergo id genus mortis, quod solet humilibus irrogari, ut omnibus facultas daretur imitandi. — His etiam illud accidit, quod passione ac morte suscepta sublimum fieri oportebat.

Adeo illum crux & re & significatione exaltavit, ut omnibus majestas ejus ac virtus cum ipsa passione notuerit. Epit. c. 51.

^o Rex vero ille teterrimus erit quidem, & ipse, sed mendaciorum, propheta. Et se ipsum constituet ac vocabit Deum, & se coli jubebit ut Dei filium. l. vii. c. 17. p. 708.

^p Quibus ex rebus aparet, prophetas omnes denuntiasse de Christo, fore aliquando, ut ex genere David corporaliter natus, constitueret æternum templum Deo, quod appellatur ecclesia, & universas gentes ad religionem Dei veram convocaret. Hæc est domus fidelis, hoc immortale templum, — cujus templi & magni & æterni quoniam Christus fabricator fuit, necesse est, habeat in eo sacerdotium sempiternum. Nec potest, nisi per eum, qui constituit templum, ad adytum templi, & ad conspectum Dei perveniri. David in Psalmo cx. id ipsum docet, dicens: Ante luciferum genui te. Juravit Dominus, & non prænitebit eum. Tu es sacerdos, &c. l. iv. c. 14. in.

' that

‘ that he should gather all nations to the worship of God. This
 ‘ is the faithful house, the immortal temple. Of which great
 ‘ and eternal temple, because Christ is the builder, it is of
 ‘ necessity, that he have it in everlasting priesthood. Nor is
 ‘ it possible to enter the temple, and obtain the sight of God,
 ‘ but by him, who erected the temple. David teacheth the
 ‘ same thing in the cxth Psalm, saying, *Before the morning star*
 ‘ *I begot thee. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou*
 ‘ *art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek.*’

These thoughts of Lactantius may be compared with some texts in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as ch. iii. 3—6. and ch. v. 5, 6. and vii. 21. And besides, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks likewise of Christ having an *unchangeable*, or eternal priesthood, ch. vii. 24. and often of our *coming to God through him*. See ch. iv. 16. vii. 25.

15.) Lactantius has an argument ¹ extremely resembling that in Heb. viii. 7—13. and quotes the same text of Jeremiah, which is there quoted, as well as some others.

16.) He says of Christ, in the words of Heb. vii. 3. that ² he was *without father, and without mother*.

17.) He says, ‘ that ³ till a testator is dead, a testament can be of no force:’ which is also in Heb. ix. 16, 17. but that is an obvious thought.

18.) He has an argument ⁴ to patience under afflictions, much resembling that in Heb. xii. 5—10.

19.) Frederic Spanheim, in his Dissertation concerning the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, alleges not any passages from Lactantius, not ⁵ expecting in him testimonies to particular books of scripture. Nevertheless he argues it to be probable, that ⁶ Lactantius received this Epistle, because it was,

¹ Sicut Hieremias propheta testatur: Ecce dies veniunt, dicit Dominus, & consummabo domui Israel & domui Juda testamentum novum.—Nam quod superius ait, consummaturum se domui Juda testamentum novum; ostendit, vetus illud testamentum, quod per Moysen est datum, non fuisse perfectum: id autem, quod per Christum dari haberet, consummatum fore. I. iv. c. 20. p. 421.

² Idcirco etiam Filium nunci oportuit, ut ipse fieret *πατήρ*, atque *αυτήρ*, &c. I. iv. c. 13. p. 387.

³ — quia nisi testator mortuus fuerit, nec confirmari testamentum potest, nec sciri, quid in eo scriptum sit; quia clausum, & obsignatum est. I. iv. c. 20. p. 420.

⁴ Quare nemini mirum debet videri, si pro nostris saepe delictis castigamur a Deo. Imo vero cum vexamur ac premimur, tum maxime gratias agimus indulgentissimo patri, quod corruptelam nostram non patitur longius procedere, sed plagis ac verberibus emendat. Ex quo intelligimus, esse nos Deo curae: quoniam cum peccamus, irascitur. I. v. c. 22. p. 532.

⁵ Paulum epistolae auctorem nec affirmat, nec negat, totus in gentibus confutandis. Spanh. Opp. T. ii. p. 201. n. vi.

⁶ Interim epistolam ad Hebraeos adscripsisse Paulo, vel ex omnium fere Latinorum, quotquot etiam ex Afris, post Lactantium, scripsere, consensu colligimus. *ibid.*

he says, generally received as Paul's by the Latin Christians after his time.

5. Doubtless Lactantius admitted the authority of all those catholic Epistles, which were universally received by Christians all along. But it is not easy to perceive in his works references to any of them. However I shall observe a few particulars.

1.) 'If' any one lack food, let us give it him: if we see 'any one naked, let us clothe him: if any one is oppressed by 'the powerful, let us rescue him. Let our dwelling be open 'to strangers, and such as have no home: let us not fail to 'defend and relieve the widow and the fatherless. It is a 'noble act of compassion, to redeem such as have been car- 'ried into captivity by enemies, as also to visit and comfort 'the sick and the poor.' See James i. 27. and ch. ii. 13, 14, 15. But it must be owned, that there are also like expressions in other books of the New Testament: as Matt. xxv. 42—44. 1 Tim. v. 10. Heb. xiii. 2.

2.) St. James says, ch. ii. 19. *The demons also believe, and tremble.* Lactantius has a like ² observation.

3.) St. James, ch. v. 20. speaks of *converting a sinner from the error of his way, and saving a soul from death.* Lactantius has like ² expressions.

4.) He says, 'that ^b Jesus is health and salvation to all those, 'who by him do believe in God:' which resembles 1 Pet. i. 21.

5.) St. Peter says, 1 ep. v. 8. *Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, seeketh whom he may devour.* Lactantius in an argument to sobriety, calls 'Satan 'our adversary,' and insists upon his dangerous temptations to intemperance. There are some other places, where ^d he seems to have eye to that text of St. Peter.

6.) St. Peter, 2 ep. i. 14. has these words: *Knowing, that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus*

^r Si quis visu indiget, impertiamus: si quis nudus occurrerit, vestiamus: si quis a potentiore injuriam sustinet, eruamus. Fateat domicilium nostrum peregrinis, vel indigentibus tecto. Pupillis defensio, viduis tutela nostra non desit. Redimere ab hoste captivos magnum misericordiae opus est. Item egros pauperes visitare atque fovere. Epit. c. 65.

^z Nam & angeli Deum metuant & demones reformidant Deum, quia torquentur ab eo & puniuntur. l. vii. c. 21. prop. in.

^a Quid igitur? Operamne perdemus? Minime. Nam si laetari hos a morte, ad quam concitissime tendunt, non potuerimus: si ab illo itinere

devio ad vitam lucemque revocare, — nostros tamen confirmabimus. l. v. c. 1. p. 457.

^b Salvator ideo, quia est sanatio & salus omnium, qui per eum credunt in Deum. Epit. c. 42. sub fin.

^c Scit ergo adversarius ille noster, quanta sit vis hujus cupiditatis. — Objicit quippe oculis imitabiles formas, suggerit fomenta, & vitiiis pabulum subministrat. l. vi. c. 22. p. 625.

^d — ne quando in laqueos adversarii nostri, — incidamus. l. iv. c. 30. p. 448. Nam & ille colluctator & adversarius noster, scis, quam sit astutus, & idem ipse violentus, sicuti nunc videmus. De Opif. c. i. p. 830.

Christ

Christ has showed me: which thing is also spoken of John xxi. 18. Lactantius observes, 'that' the apostles of Christ did not only 'suffer death for the gospel, but they likewise knew it before-hand, and foretold it.' Whether he refers to that text of St. Peter, or to some text of St. Paul, where he speaks of expecting death, or to both, we cannot certainly say. See 2 Tim. iv. 6.

7.) Lactantius says, 'He' that does not acknowledge the 'Son, neither can he acknowledge the Father.' Which is very agreeable to 1 John ii. 23. But there is somewhat resembling that observation in words of our Lord, John viii. 19. and in xiv. 1—7.

8.) Speaking of Christians, he says, 'No' evil can so afflict us, as to hinder us from keeping the faith that has 'been delivered to us.' But we cannot be sure that he refers to Jude, ver. 3.

6. That Lactantius received and respected the book of the Revelation, is evident from what he writes about Christ's coming to reign a thousand years upon this earth. I refer in the margin to some places in ^b the Institutions, and ^c the Epitome, where he plainly borrows from the Revelation.

1.) Moreover he expressly cites it. 'The' Son of God,' says he, 'has a name known to none but himself, and the Father, as John teacheth in the Revelation:' undoubtedly intending Rev. xix. 12. *And he had a name, which no man knew, but himself.*

2.) He quotes the book very respectfully, saying, 'The' divine scriptures call the future everlasting punishment of 'bad men the second death.' See Rev. ii. 11.

7. We saw before what Lactantius says of all Scripture consisting of the Old and the New Testament. This collection he calls ^m divine scripture, ⁿ sacred books, ^o scriptures of truth,

^e Et qui non tantum pro fide mortem subierint, sed etiam, morituros esse se, & scierint & prædixerint. l. v. c. 3. p. 464.

^f Nec sibi de summo Deo vel Judæi vel Philosophi blandiantur. Qui Filium non agnovit, nec Patrem potuit agnoscere. Epit. c. 49. prop. in.

^g Nullus nos metus, nullus terror inflectat, quo minus traditam nobis fidem custodiamus. Epit. c. 66.

^h Vid. Inst. l. vii. c. 17.

ⁱ Epit. c. 73, 74.

^k Hujus nomen nulli est notum, nisi ipsi & Patri, sicut docet Johannes in Revelatione. Epit. c. 42. sub fin.

^l Is vero damnatus æternam luit poenam, quam divinæ literæ secundam mortem nominant, l. vii. c. 10.

p. 679. Eam poenam secundam mortem nominamus. l. ii. c. 12. p. 206.

^m Docent autem divinæ literæ non extingui animas, sed aut pro justitia præmio affici, aut poena pro sceleribus sempiterna. l. iii. c. 19. p. 302.

ⁿ Sed tamen sanctæ literæ docent: in quibus cautum est, illum Dei filium, Dei esse sermonem. l. iv. c. 8, p. 370. Mentiuntur fortasse literæ sanctæ, docentes tantam fuisse in eo potestatem, ut imperio suo cogeret ventos, &c. ib. c. 15. p. 399.

^o Nullas enim literas veritatis attingerant. l. ii. c. 10. p. 195. Sed videlicet Græci, qui sacras veritatis literas non attingerant. l. iii. c. 16. p. 288.

archives^p of sacred scripture, word of God, and the like: sometimes by such expressions particularly intending the Old, at other times the New Testament. 'Bring me a man,' says^q he, 'who is passionate, abusive, ungovernable; with a few words of God I will make him as meek as a lamb.' He also frequently calls them^r heavenly scriptures.

1.) And though Lactantius, for a reason formerly assigned, scrupled to quote the New Testament, as decisive; he doubtless so esteemed it, in like manner as he did the Old, which he frequently quotes, as of authority. 'But' why do I strive to prove the immortality of the soul by arguments, when we have divine testimonies?^s 'For the sacred scriptures and the words of the prophets teach it.' And in another place, to the like purpose, he says, 'he' will prove the future rewards of virtue by probable arguments of reason, and by testimonies of the divine scriptures.' And in many of the passages just cited, and transcribed by me in the margin, the epithets, sacred and divine, are given by him to the scriptures of the New Testament. And referring to the sublime moral directions of the Christian revelation, which are either in the gospels, or the epistles, he not seldom introduces them in this respectful manner: God^t commands us not to boast of good works done by us, and the like.

2.) Lactantius more than once intimates, that^u the celestial scriptures were despised and derided by many heathens, for want of elegance and politeness of style. As for himself, he approves of the style of Scripture, as it is: saying, that^v it is

^p — ante diem septimam Calendarum Aprilium judæi Christum cruci affixerunt. Hic rerum textus, hic ordo in arcais sanctarum literarum continetur. l. iv. c. 10. p. 279.

^q See before, p. 42. note 4.
^r — quos vera cælestium literarum doctrina non imbuunt. l. iv. c. 22. in. Quidam vero non satis cælestibus literis erudit. l. iv. c. 30. p.

^s Sed quid argumentis colligimus æternas esse animas, quam habeamus testimonia divina? Id enim sacre literæ & voces prophetarum docent. Epit. c. 71.
^t Satis & huic parti faciamus, tum testimoniis divinarum literarum, tum etiam probabilibus argumentis. — l. vii. c. 1. p. 646.

^u Idem Deus præcepit, ut si quando cœnam paraverimus. — l. vi. c. 12. sub in. Monet enim Deus operatorem justitiæ, non oportere esse jactantem. — l. vi. c. 18. prop. in. Quod quidem ita Deus præcepit. — l. vi. c. 23. p. 630. — faciamus quæ jubet

illuminator, noster Deus. l. v. c. 18. prop. in. Præcepit Deus, non occidere solem super iram nostram. ib. sub fin.

^x Inde est, quod scriptis cælestibus, quia videntur incompta, non facile credunt, qui aut ipsi sunt deserti, aut diserta legere malunt, nec quærunt vera, sed dulcia. — Ita respuunt veritatem, dum sermonis suavitate capiuntur. Epit. c. 62. Nam hæc in primis causa est, cur apud sapientes & doctos & principes hujus sæculi, scriptura sancta fide careat, quod prophetæ communi ac simplici sermone, ut ad populum, sunt locuti. Contemnuntur itaque ab iis, qui nihil audire vel legere, nisi expolitum ac disertum, volunt. — Non credunt ergo divinis, quia fuco^y careant: sed ne illis quidem, qui ea interpretantur, quia sunt & ipsi aut omnino rudes, aut certe parum docti. l. v. c. 1. p. 458.

^y Adfuerit enim dulcibus & politis sive orationibus sive carminibus divinarum literarum simpli-

the effect of wise design. Divine things are delivered to us without artificial ornaments, in the language of the people, that all might understand what God spake to all.

3.) By which it may be perceived, that Lactantius was not for concealing the scriptures from men of any condition. And indeed he says in another place, 'If ^a any one desires farther information upon the point, or does not intirely credit me, let him go to the sacred treasury of the celestial scriptures.'

4.) He has another just observation concerning the concise authority, with which things are usually delivered in scripture. 'It ^a is such as became God, when speaking to men. Many reasons and arguments are needless, and would have been improper, and unbecoming the divine majesty.' Seneca has a like ^b observation.

5.) He has an argument in behalf of the credibility of the evangelical history, in answer to one of the heathen authors, who in his time wrote against the Christians: 'This history,' says he, is true. For it is intirely uniform, and consistent throughout, though written by illiterate and ignorant men. Nor did they invent, for the sake of gain, or any other worldly advantage; for they taught and practised the strictest rules of self-denial. They not only died in testimony to the doctrine they preached, but they knew before-hand, that they must die for it, and foretold their death. And they declared likewise, that all others who received their doctrine, must suffer persecution.'

cem communemque sermonem pro foudido aspernantur. Num igitur Deus, & mentis & vocis & linguæ artifex, diserte loqui non potest? Immo vero summa providentia carente furo voluit ea, quæ divina sunt, ut omnes intelligerent ea, quæ ipse omnibus loquebatur. l. vi. c. 21.

^a — ut testimonio utamur, immensum est. Si quis illa desiderat, aut nobis minus credit, adeat ad ipsum sacrarium cælestium literarum. Epit. c. 70. al. 72. p. 237. ed. Davil.

^a Quæ quidem tradita sunt breviter ac nude. Nec enim decebat aliter: ut, cum Deus ad hominem loqueretur, argumentis assereret suas voces, tanquam fides ei non haberetur: sed, ut oportuit, est locutus, quasi rerum omnium maximus iudex, cuius non est argumentari, sed pronuntiare. Verum ipse ut Deus. l. iii. c. 1. p. 235.

^b In hac re dissentio a Possidonio. Non probo, quod Platonis legibus adjecta principia sunt. Legem enim brevem esse oportet, quo facilius ab imperitis teneatur, velut emissæ

divinitus vox sit. Jubeat, non disputes. Nihil videtur mihi frigidius, nihil ineptius, quam lex cum prologo. Senec. Ep. 94. T. ii. p. 446, 447. Amst. 1672.

^c Absuit ergo ab his fingendi voluntas & astutia, quoniam rudes fuerunt. Aut quis possit indoctus apta inter se & coherentia fingere, cum philosophorum doctissimi, Plato & Aristoteles, & Epicurus & Zenon, ipsi sibi repugnantia & contraria dixerint? Hæc est enim mendaciorum natura, ut coherere non possint. Illorum autem traditio, quia vera est, quadrat undique, ac sibi tota consentit, & ideo persuadet. — Non igitur quæstus & commodi gratia religionem illam commenti sunt, quippe & præcepta & re ipsa vitam secuti sunt, quæ & voluptatibus caret, & omnia, quæ habentur in bonis, spernit: & qui non tantum pro sola morte subierint, sed etiam morituros esse se, & scierint & prædixerint, & postea universos, qui eorum disciplinam secuti essent, acerba & nefanda passuros. l. v. c. 3. in.

VII. It will be some addition to our trouble, to consider, whether Lactantius quotes any books, which are not a part of the present received canon of Christians, with the like regard to what he has shewn to those already mentioned.

1. And it must be owned, that he has frequently quoted in his Divine Institutions the Sibylline Verses, or the Poems of the Sibyls, and some writings of Hydaspes, and Hermes Trismegistus; or however, writings ascribed to them: and once a book, intitled the Preaching of Peter.

2. The Sibylline verses more especially are quoted by him. He considers them, as containing predictions concerning Christ, and some of them very plain. He makes use of them, as arguments for the truth of the history of things recorded in the sacred Scripture, and believed and taught by Christians. Nevertheless he did not reckon them a part of those books, which were of authority with Christians. A few quotations from him may render this evident.

3. 'The Sibyl^d testifies, that man is the work of God. The same is contained in the sacred scriptures.' And soon after: 'As^e the sacred scriptures teach, and likewise the Erythræan Sibyl.' Therefore the Sibylline poems were not a part of scripture.

4. Though the Sibyls, according to him, foretold many future thing, he does not allow them the title and character of prophets, in the most honourable sense of the word. 'That these things,' says he, 'were to come to pass, is declared in the words of the prophets, and in the Sibylline poems.' And exactly to the same purpose in the^s Epitome. Again: 'Epicurus, who^h denied a future state, is confuted not only by the rest of the philosophers, and the common opinion, but likewise by the answers of oracles, the poems of the Sibyls, and the divine words of the prophets.' I put in the marginⁱ another like place.

5. Moreover, though Lactantius thought fit to fetch arguments from these writings, in support of the Christian religion against heathens, it can never be suspected, that he allowed

^d Sibylla hominem Dei opus esse testatur.

— Eadem sanctæ literæ continent. l. ii. c. 11. p. 202, 203.

^e — sicut sacræ literæ docent, & Sibylla Erythræa. — ib. c. 12. p. 210.

^f Hæc autem sic futura fuisse, & prophetarum vocibus, & Sibyllinis carminibus denuntiatur. l. iv. c. 18. p. 410.

^g Quæ omnia & in Prophetarum libris, & in carminibus Sibyllinis, prædicta invenimus. Ep. c. 45.

^h Quid quod idem animas extinguibiles facit: quem refellunt non modo philosophi, & publica persuasio: verum etiam responsa vatum, carmina Sibyllarum, ipsæ denique divinæ voces prophetarum. Epit. c. 36.

ⁱ Id enim sacræ literæ ac voces Prophetarum docent. Quod si cui parum id videtur, legat carmina Sibyllarum. Apollinis quoque Milesii responsa consideret. Epit. c. 70. al. 71. p. 235. Davif.

them canonical authority, because he ascribed their predictions to the instinct of dæmons. 'The ^k prophets,' says he, 'fore-told these things by the Spirit of God: the diviners, as Hy-dæspes, Hermes, the Sibyl, by the impulse of dæmons:' that is, evil spirits. For, as Origen assures us, with ^l Christians, all dæmons were so reputed: they did not call any good beings dæmons.

6. That Lactantius calls all those writers vates, or diviners, we have just seen. In the like manner he speaks of them in other ^m places. That under that title and character the Sibyls are included, is most manifest from a ⁿ passage, which I place at the bottom of the page.

7. His reasons for frequently quoting these writings, and his views therein, appear, I think, in this passage of the seventh book of the Institutions: 'I ^o have proved the immortality of the soul by reason. It remains, that I produce testimonies to the same doctrine: nevertheless, I shall not now cite the prophets,—but such witnesses rather, as they cannot refuse, who as yet know not the truth.' After which he proceeds to allege Hermes Trismegistus, an oracle of Apollo, and the Sibylline poems. He speaks to the like purpose in the first book of the ^p Institutions.

8. I have already several times ^q had occasion to take notice of these Sibylline books, and of the use which Lactantius, in particular, has made of them. I would add here, that Lactantius having shewn what was the number of Sibyls, according ^r to accounts given by Varro, and several other learned

^k Hæc ita futura esse, cum prophetæ omnes ex Dei spiritu, tum etiam vates ex instinctu dæmonum cecinerunt. — Sed & illud non sine dæmonum fraude subtractum est, missum iri a Patre tunc filium Dei, — quod Hermes tamen non dissimulavit. — Sibyllæ quoque non aliter fore ostendunt. l. vii. c. 18.

^l Καὶ μὲν ἐν ἡμῶς, τῆς δεξιᾶς, πάλαι δαιμονίας οὐκ ἦν Φαῦλος. Or. contr. Cels. l. viii. T. 1. p. 770. E. F. Benediſt.

^m Denique ut taceam de prophetis unius Dei prædicatoribus, poetæ quæ, & philosophi, & vates testimonium singulari Deo perhibent. Epit. c. 3. prop. in.

ⁿ Superest de vatibus dicere. Varro decem Sibyllas fuisse tradit. Epit. c. 5. in.

^o Declaravi, ut opinor, animam non esse solubilem. Superest, citare testes, quorum auctoritate argumenta firmentur. Neque nunc prophetas in testimonium vocabo, — sed eos potius, quibus illos, qui respuunt veritatem, credere sit

necesse. Hermes naturam hominis defendens. — Polites quidam consuluit Apollinem Milesium, utrum maneat anima post mortem, an resolvatur: & respondit his versibus. — Quid Carmina Sibyllina? — l. vii. c. 13. in. &c.

^p Sed cum defendamus causam veritatis apud eos, qui oberrantes a veritate falsis religionibus serviunt: quod genus probationis adversum eos magis adhibere debemus, quam ut deorum suorum testimoniis revincamus? l. i. c. 6. fin.

^q See Sibylline Books in the Index.

^r M. Varro, qui nemo unquam doctior, ne apud Græcos, necdum apud Latinos, in libris rerum divinarum. — Cum de Quindecim Viris loqueretur, Sibyllinos libros ait, non fuisse unius Sibyllæ, sed appellari uno nomine Sibyllinos, quod omnes scemina vates Sibyllæ sunt a veteribus appellatæ. — Cætera Sibyllas decem numero fuisse, easque omnes enumeravit. l. i. c. 6. p. 31.

heathen

heathen authors, informs us, what Sibylline books he made use of and quoted, or supposed he quoted. He says, that the volumes of the Cumæan Sibyl, containing the fates of the Roman empire, are kept secret; but the books of the rest are open to every body. He speaks to this purpose in the ^a Institutions, the ^b Epitome, and ^c the treatise Of the Wrath of God. He says, in ^x the Epitome, that all the Sibylline books, except those of the Cumæan Sibyl, teach one God, Creator and Governor of the world. In ^y the Institutions he seems to say the same thing of all in general, without exception, particularly the Erythræan Sibyl, in verses brought to Rome from Erythræ, by order of the senate.

9. The Preaching of Peter is but once quoted by Lactantius; it is in this manner: 'After ^z his resurrection, Christ opened to his disciples all things which should come to pass, which things Peter and Paul preached at Rome. And for the better remembrance, that preaching has been written, and remains to this time. In which, beside many other wonderful things, they say it would come to pass, that in a short time God would send a king, who would conquer the Jews, overthrow their cities, and bring upon them many dreadful afflictions and calamities.'

Upon this book I have already had occasion to make divers remarks, in ^a the chapter of Clement of Alexandria, and in the article of ^b the Anonymous Author of the treatise Of Rebab-

vatibus dicere. Varro decem Sibyllas fuisse, tradit, primam de Persis, — quartam Cumæanam, quintam Erythræam. — Epit. c. 5.

^a Harum omnium Sibyllarum carmina & feruntur & habentur, præterquam Cumææ: cujus libri a Romanis occultantur. Nec eos ab ullo, nisi a Quindecim Viris, inspectos habent. l. i. c. 6. p. 35, 36.

^t Ex his omnibus Cumææ solius tres esse libros, qui Romanorum fata contineant, & habeantur arcani; cæterarum autem fere omnium singulos exilare haberique vulgo, sed eos Sibyllinos velut uno nomine inscribi, nisi quod Erythræa, — nomen suum verum posuit in libro, aliarum confusi sunt. Hæ omnes, de quibus dixi, Sibyllæ, præter Cumæam, quam legi nisi a Quindecim viris non licet, unum Deum esse testantur principem, conditorem, — Epit. c. 5.

^a Verum quia plures, ut ostendi, Sibyllæ a doctissimis auctoribus fuisse traduntur, — Cumææ quidem volumina, quibus Romana fata conscripta sunt, in arcanis habentur: cæterarum tamen fere omnium li-

belli, quo minus in usu sint omnibus, non vetantur. De Ira Dei, cap. 23. in.

^x See before note ^t. ^y Omnes igitur hæ Sibyllæ unum Deum prædicant, maxime tamen Erythræa, quæ celebrior, inter cæteras ac nobilior habetur. Siquidem Fenestella, diligentissimus scriptor, de quindecim viris dicens, ait: Restituto Capitolio, retulisse ad senatum C. Curionem Cos. ut legati Erythas mitterentur, qui carmina Sibyllæ conquesta Romam deportarent. — In iis ergo versibus, quos legati Romam attulerunt, de uno Deo hæc sunt testimonia. l. i. c. 6. p. 37.

^z Sed & futura aperuit illis omnia, quæ Petrus & Paulus Romæ prædicaverunt, Et ea prædicatio in memoriam scripta permanfit: in qua cum multa alia mira, tum etiam hoc futurum esse dixerunt, ut post breve tempus immitteret Deus regem, qui expugnet Judæos, & civitates eorum solo adæquaret, ipsos autem fame sitique obsideret. — l. iv. c. 21. p. 422, 423.

^a Vol. ii. p. 236—239. ^b Vol. iii. p. 197.

tizing, joined with St. Cyprian's works : to which the reader is referred.

Upon this passage of Lactantius we may now make the following remarks.

1.) It is probable, that this book contained some account of the preaching both of St. Peter and St. Paul.

2.) It is likely, that Lactantius did not know who was the author of it.

3.) There is no reason to conclude from this passage, that the preaching here spoken of, was esteemed by Lactantius, or other Christians at that time, a book of authority, or a part of sacred scripture.

VIII. Nothing remains, but that we briefly sum up this writer's testimony to the scriptures.

We have seen in Lactantius references to the gospels, the Acts of the apostles, and some of the epistles, and to the book of the Revelation, which he expressly quotes as sacred scripture, and written by John. We have likewise observed plain proof of his having a collection of scriptures, consisting of the Old and New Testament ; which he esteemed sacred and divine, and of the highest authority. If Lactantius had not purposely restrained himself from quoting Christian scriptures in his arguments with heathens, his testimony would have been much more full and particular. For, notwithstanding the reservedness, which he imposed on himself in that respect, there are in him many allusions and references to them : which seems to shew, that the Christians of that time were so habituated to the language of scripture, that it was not easy for them to avoid the use of it, whenever they discoursed upon things of a religious nature.

His quotations of Sibylline books, and other writings, ascribed to heathen vates or diviners, such as Hydaspes and Hermes Trismegistus, have been just now accounted for. And it has been shewn, that he was far from esteeming them of canonical authority. Nor does it appear, that he placed the Preaching of Peter and Paul in the rank of sacred scripture, though he has once quoted it.

IX. We come now to the author of the book *Of the Deaths of Persecutors* : in whom there are no quotations of scripture, and but few references or allusions to it. I shall therefore transcribe but little from him at present.

1. It is manifest, that he refers to the Acts of the apostles, and perhaps to the gospels likewise, in the second chapter of his

his work : ' Near ' the end of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, as
 ' we find it written, our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified by
 ' the Jews. When he had risen again on the third day, he
 ' assembled his disciples, whom the fright of his apprehension
 ' had dispersed. And continuing with them forty days, he
 ' opened their hearts, and explained to them the scriptures,
 ' which to that time were obscure and difficult to them. He
 ' also gave them instructions concerning the preaching his
 ' doctrine.—When he had so done, he was surrounded by a
 ' cloud, which withdrawing him from human sight carried
 ' him up to heaven. Whereupon his disciples, who were then
 ' eleven, taking into the room of Judas the traitor Matthias
 ' and Paul, went abroad throughout the world, and preached
 ' the gospel, as the Lord had commanded them.'

2. This writer speaks of the early success of the apostles in
 preaching the gospel, and the swift progress of the Christian
 religion in the^d time of Nero, and afterwards, particularly^e
 in the times following the reign of Domitian.

3. He speaks^f of the coming of Antichrist : perhaps he has
 therein an eye to the book of the Revelation.

4. Finally, he takes notice of the burning^g of the Christian
 scriptures in Dioclesian's persecution.

^e *Extremis temporibus Tiberii Cæsaris, ut scriptum legimus, Dominus noster Jesus Christus a Judæis cruciatus est post diem decimum calendarum Aprilis, duobus Geminis Consulibus. Cum resurrexisset die tertio, congregavit discipulos, quos metus comprehensionis ejus in fugam verterat, & diebus quadraginta cum his commoratus, aperuit corda eorum, & scripturas interpretatus est, quæ usque ad id tempus obscuræ & involutæ fuerant. Ordinavitque eos, & instruxit ad prædicationem dogmatis ac doctrinæ suæ.—Quo officio repleto, circumvolvit eum procella nubes, & subtrahit oculis hominum rapuit in cælum. Et inde discipuli, qui tunc erant undecim, assumtis in locum Judæi proditoris Matthia & Paulo, dispersi sunt per omnem terram ad evangelium prædicandum, sicut illis magister Dominus imperaverat.—De M. P. c. 2. in.*

^d — & per annos 25. usque ad principium Neroniani imperii per omnes provincias & civitates ecclesiæ fundamenta miserunt. — Qua re ad Neronem delata, cum animadverteret, non modo Ro-

mæ, sed ubique quotidie magnam multitudinem deficere a cultu idolorum, & ad religionem novam, damnata vetustate, transire.—ib. c. 2.

^e Rescissis igitur actis Tyranni, non modo in statum pristinum ecclesiæ restituta est, sed etiam multo clarius ac floridius enituit : secutisque temporibus, quibus multi ac boni principes Romani imperii clavum regimenque tenuerunt, nullos inimicorum impetus passa, manus suas in orientem occidentemque porrexit : ut jam nullus esset terrarum angulus tam remotus, quo non religio Dei penetrasset, nulla denique natio tam feris moribus vivens, ut non suscepto Dei cultu ad justitiæ opera miteretur. cap. 3. fin.

^f — ut quia primus persecutus est, idem etiam novissimus persequatur, & Antichristi præcedat adventum.—cap. 2.

^g Qui dies cum illuxisset, — repente adhuc dubia luce ad ecclesiæ profectus cum ducibus ac tribunis & rationalibus venit : & revulsis foribus simulachrum Dei queritur, scripturæ repertæ incenduntur. cap. 12.

C H A P. LXVI.

OF BURNING THE SCRIPTURES, AND OF TRAITORS, IN THE TIME OF DIOCLESIAN'S PERSECUTION.

1. EUSEBIUS assures us, that in the imperial edict for Dioclesian's persecution in 303. it was expressly ordered, not only that the Christian churches should be demolished, but also that^a their scriptures should be burned. And this was one of the affecting scenes of that persecution, that^b he had seen the sacred and divine scriptures burned in market-places.

2. This order shews, that the heathen people were now sensible of the importance of the scriptures, which the Christians made use of as the grounds of their religion, the rule of their conduct, and the support of their steadiness and zeal.

3. The burning^c of the scriptures is also mentioned by the author Of the Deaths of Persecutors, in his account of this persecution; but he does not speak of it so particularly, and so much at large, as might have been expected.

4. Arnobius likewise refers to it, and insists, that^d there was nothing dishonourable to the Deity in the scriptures of the Christians, that should expose them to such usage from the heathen people: though many writings of their own well deserved to perish in the flames.

5. The first council of Arles, which met in 314. soon after the persecution was over, made a canon, that^e whoever of the clergy should be convicted by the public acts of betraying to the persecutors the scriptures, or any of the holy vessels, or the names of any of their brethren, should be deposed.

6. This was peculiar to Dioclesian's persecution: at least we do not know of any such order before.

7. The persecution was for a while exceeding hot in Africa, both in Numidia, and in the proconsular province: the two governors of which, Anulinus and Florus, acted with great severity toward the Christians, as Optatus^f relates. The in-

^a — τας δὲ γραφὰς ἀφανὲς πυρὶ γι-
νοβαί ἀποσπασθῆναι. H. E. l. viii. c. 2.
p. 291.

^b — τας δὲ ἐνθεὺς καὶ
ἱεράς γραφὰς κατὰ μισθὰς ἀσέβας πυρὶ πα-
ραδιδόμεναις αἰσῶς ἐπεδομένον ὀφθαλμοῖς. ib.
p. 293. C.

^c Scripturæ repertæ in-
cenduntur. De M. P. c. 12.

^d Quod si haberet vos aliqua pro religi-
onibus indignatio, has potius literas, hos

exurere debuistis libros. Nam nostra qui-
dem scripta cur ignibus meruerunt dari?—
Arnob. l. iv. sub fin.

^e De his qui
scripturas sanctas tradidisse dicuntur, vel
vasa dominica, vel nomina fratrum suorum,
placuit nobis, ut quicumque eorum ex actis
publicis fuerit detectus, non verbis nudis,
ab ordine cleri amoveatur. Concil. Arl.
i. c. 13.

^f Alia persecutio, quæ fuit

quest after the scriptures, and other sacred things, was very strict in that country: the magistrates in the several cities were very active and diligent in their searches: they seized what they could by any means discover, and gave informations, as they saw fit, to the superior officers of their district. And here seems to have been the greatest number of traitors: some bishops, as well as others, were guilty of that crime, which Optatus^s laments.

8. How the imperial orders were published and executed, may be seen in the^a Acts of Felix, an African bishop, who suffered martyrdom at the beginning of the persecution, for refusing to deliver up the scriptures. I transcribe those Acts in the margin somewhat largely. They shew the great regard which the Christians of that time had for the sacred scriptures. And the reader may there observe, that the book of the Acts of the apostles was well known, and received in Africa.

9. There are extant 'Acts'¹ of the martyrs Saturninus presbyter, Felix, Dativus, Ampelius, and others, who on account of the assemblies, and the sacred scriptures, having been examined and made confession before Anulinus the proconsul of Africa at Carthage, at divers times, and in divers places, shed their precious blood.' These Acts^k are the work of a Donatist writer; nevertheless they are very curious.

sub Diocletiano & Maximiano. Quo tempore fuerunt & impii iudices, bellum Christiano nomini inferentes. Ex quibus in Provincia Proconsulari fuerat Anulinus, in Numidia Florus. Omnibus notum est, quid eorum operata sit artificiosa crudelitas: — Alii cogeantur templa Dei vivi subvertere: alii Christum negare: alii leges divinas incendere: alii thura ponere. Optat. l. iii. c. 8.

§ In Africa duo mala & pessima admissa esse constat, unum in traditione, alterum in schismate. — Nam ferme ante annos sexaginta, & quod excurrit, per totam Africam persecutionis est divagata tempestas. — Ipsi apices & principes omnium, aliqui episcopi, illis temporibus, ut damno æternæ vitæ, illius incertæ lucis moras brevissimas compararent, instrumenta divinæ legis tradiderunt. Optat. l. i. c. 13.

^b Diocletiano octies & Maximiano septies Coll. — exivit edictum Imperatorum & Cæsarum super omnem faciem terræ. Et propositum est per colonias & civitates principibus & magistratibus, suo cuique loco, ut libros deificos peterent de manu episcoporum & presbyterorum. Tunc programma positum est in civitate Tibiurense. — Tunc Magnilianus Curator jussit ad se perduci

per officialem. Cui Magnilianus Curator dixit: Da libros, vel membranas quascumque habes. Felix episcopus dixit: Habeo, sed non do. Magnilianus curator dixit. Da libros, ut possint aduri. Felix episcopus dixit: Melius est me igne aduri, quam scripturas deificas: quia bonum est obedire Deo magis quam hominibus. [Act. v. 29.] — Præfatus dixit: Felicem gladio interficite. Et ductus est ad passionis locum. — Felix episcopus, elevans oculos in cælum, clara voce dixit: Deus, gratias tibi. Quinquaginta & sex annos habeo in hoc seculo. Virginitatem custodivi: Evangelia servavi: fidem & veritatem prædicavi. Ap. Ruinart. p. 355 — 357.

ⁱ Ap. Baluz. Miscell. T. ii. p. 56. &c. & Optat. ex edit. Du Pin. p. 150. &c.

^k Scripta sane sunt ista, quod negari non potest, ab aliquo Donatista, sed docto & erudito. Dignaque mihi visa sunt quæ cum Lactantio [De M. P.] conjungerentur, cum ob similitudinem argumenti, tum ob elegantiam sermonis. — Opus tamen est antiqui scriptoris, & qui non admodum remotus fuit ab ævo Diocletiani. Baluz. Monit. apud Du Pin, ut supra, p. 150.

10. These persons were apprehended at their worship, and carried to Carthage in the year 304; where they made a glorious confession, and surmounted all the temptations they met with.

11. The author relates * the edict of the emperors Diocletian and Maximian, for burning the scriptures, for demolishing churches, and forbidding the assemblies of divine worship; and bears an honourable testimony to the fidelity and fortitude of the Christians at that time. And he particularly relates the ¹ examinations of the persons above-mentioned, and the resolute answers made by them. It will appear likewise, from what I shall transcribe in the margin from this piece, that the Christians of Africa were very assiduous in the assemblies of public worship, and constantly had there readings of scripture.

12. If that writer may be credited, there ^m had been a miraculous appearance in that place, when the bishop Fundanus had delivered up some scriptures, a short time before.

13. The inquiries of the heathen persecutors at that time, were not confined to the scriptures, but they searched likewise for sacred vessels, and seized gold and silver cups, and lamps, and suits of apparel ready made for the use of poor people, as occasions might require. This may be collected from the canon of the council of Arles before quoted, and more particularly from an ⁿ enumeration of such things, taken from the

* Temporibus namque Diocletiani & Maximiani bellum diabolus Christianis indixit isto modo, ut sacrosancta Domini testamenta scripturaeque divinas ad exurendum peteret, basilicas dominicas subverteret, & ritus cœtusque sanctissimos celebrari Domino prohiberet. Sed non tulit exercitus Dei immane præceptum. — Et quamvis tradendo gentilibus scripturas dominicas atque testamenta divina profanis ignibus comburenda, a fidei cardine cecidere nonnulli, conservando tamen eas, & pro ipsis libenter suum sanguinem effundendo fortiter fecere quamplurimi. Aët. Saturnin. &c. n. ii.

¹ — Contra quæ confessores Domini, invicti martyres Christi, tamquam ex uno ore dixerunt: Christiani sumus. Non possumus nisi Domini legem sanctam usque ad effusionem sanguinis custodire. Qua voce percussus inimicus Felici dicebat: Non quæro, utrum Christianus sis: sed an collectam feceris, vel scripturas aliquas habeas. — Respondit: Quasi Christianus sine Dominico possit, aut Dominicus sine Christiano celebrari. — Collectam, inquit, gloriosissime celebravimus, ad scrip-

turas dominicas legendas in dominicum convenimus semper. *ibid.* n. x.

^m In isto namque foro jam pro scripturis dominicis dimicaverat cœlum, cum Fundanus civitatis quondam episcopus scripturas dominicas traderet exurendas: quas cum magistratus sacrilegus igni apponeret, subito imber sereno cœlo diffunditur, ignis scripturis sanctis adnotus exstinguitur, grandines adhibentur, omnisque ipsa regio pro scripturis dominicis, elementis furentibus, devastabatur. *ib.* n. iii.

ⁿ — Ex ætæ Munatii Felicis flaminis perpetui, perpetui curatoris colonie Cirtensium. Cum ventum esset ad domum in qua Christiani conveniebant, Felix flamen perpetuus curator Paulo episcopo dixit. Proferte scripturas, & si quid aliud hic habetis. Paulus episcopus dixit: Scripturas lectores habent. Sed nos quod hic habemus damus. In brevi sic. — Calices duo aurei, item calices sex argentei, urceola sex argentea, — lucernæ argenteæ vii. candelæ breves æneæ cum lucernis suis vii. item lucernæ æneæ xi. cum catenis suis, tunicæ muliebres lxxii. tunicæ viriles xvi. caligæ viriles paria xiii.

public

public Acts or Register of the city of Cirtha, where is an account of things taken with the consent, or by the discovery of Paul, the bishop, and one of the deacons, Silvanus, who therefore are reckoned traitors. Which is also taken notice of by Augustine, in an epistle of his, a part of which I shall transcribe in the ° margin, for the sake of curious readers.

C H A P. LXVII.

THE DONATISTS.

- I. *Donatus, bishop of Carthage.* II. *A brief history of the Donatists:* 1. *The ground of the controversy between them and the catholics.* 2. *The rise and occasion of the controversy.* 3. *Their numbers.* 4. *Their persecutions.* III. *Donatist writers:* 1. *Anonymous author of the Acts of Saturninus and others.* 2. *Cresconius.* 3. *Gaudentius.* 4. *Macrobius.* 5. *Parmenian.* 6. *Petilian.* 7. *Tichonius.* 8. *Vitellius.* IV. *Their testimony to the scriptures.*

I. SAYS Jerom, ‘Donatus,’ from whom sprang the Donatists in Africa, in the times of the (A) emperors Constantius and Constantine, asserting, that the scriptures had been betrayed to the heathen by our people in the time of the persecution, by his plausible speeches deceived almost all Africa, especially Numidia. There are extant many small works of his in support of his own heresy, and a book *Of the Holy Spirit*, agreeable to the Arian doctrine.

caligæ muliebres paria xlvii. &c. Acta Purgationis Cæcil. ap. Optat. Du Pin, p. 168. — recita illi gesta apud Monatium Felicem Flaminem perpetuum curatorem tunc civitatis vestræ, Diocletiano octavum, & Maximiano septimum consulibus—quibus liquido constitit Paulum episcopum tradidisse, ut Silvanus tunc ejus subdiaconus fuerit, & cum illo tradiderit proferens instrumenta Dominica, etiam quæ diligentissime fuerant occultata, capitulatam argenteam, & lucernam argenteam. — Ep. 53. n. 4.

* Donatus, a quo Donatiani, per Africam sub Constantio Constantinoque principibus assertens a nostris scripturas in persecutione Edmæ traditas, totam pene Africam, &

maxime Numidiam sua persuasione decepit. Extant ejus multa ad suam hæresim pertinentia opuscula, & de Spiritu Sancto liber Ariano dogmati congruens. De V. I. cap. 93.

(A) ‘In the times of the emperors Constantius and Constantine.’] Here are various readings. Sophronius the Greek interpreter has only Constantius. In Martianay’s edition is ‘sub Constante Constantinoque.’ But I imagine the right reading to be as above: and that by Constantius Jerom intends Constantine’s father; the Donatian controversy having had its foundation in what happened near the beginning of Dioclesian’s persecution, during the reign of Constantius.

I shall

I shall now transcribe likewise a part of Augustine's article in his book of Heresies concerning the Donatists, with whom certainly he was well acquainted. I put it down here, as it has some account of this Donatus, the second bishop of the party at Carthage, and as a foundation of farther remarks hereafter.

' The ^b Donatians, or Donatists, who at first made a schism, because Cæcilian had been ordained bishop of Carthage against their mind, accused him of crimes they could never prove, and objected likewise, that he had been ordained by the betrayers of the divine scriptures. And by their continued obstinacy turned their schism into heresy. Their notion is, that by means of Cæcilian's crimes, whether true, or rather false, as appeared to those who were chosen judges of the cause, the church of Christ has perished throughout the world, and subsists only in Africa among themselves. Every where else, according to them, the church is lost by communicating with unworthy persons. They take upon them to re-baptize catholics.—We have understood, that the first author of this heresy was Donatus of Numidia, who came to Carthage, and divided the Christian people under Cæcilian, and getting other bishops of a like disposition to join them, ordained Majorinus bishop of that city. Which Majorinus was succeeded by another Donatus, who by his eloquence greatly strengthened this heresy; and many think they are called Donatists from him. There are writings of his still extant, by which it appears, that he did not hold the catholic doctrine of the Trinity. For though he allowed the Son to be of the same substance, he thought him inferior

^b Donatiani, vel Donatistæ, sunt, qui primum propter ordinatum contra suam voluntatem Cæcilianum ecclesiæ Carthaginensis episcopum schisma fecerunt: objicientes ei crimina non probata, & maxime quod a traditoribus divinarum scripturarum fuerit ordinatus. Sed post causam cum eo dictam atque finitam falsitatis rei deprehensi, pertinaci dissensione firmata, in hæresim schisma verterunt: tanquam ecclesia Christi propter crimina Cæciliani, seu vera, seu, quod magis judicibus apparuit, falsa, de toto terrarum orbe perierit, ubi futura promissa est, atque in Africana Donati parte remanserit, in aliis terrarum partibus quasi contagione communionis extincta. Audent etiam rebaptizare Catholicos.—Hujus hæresis principem accepimus fuisse Donatum, qui de Numidia veniens, & contra Cæcilianum Christianam dividens plebem,

adjunctis sibi ejusdem factionis episcopis, Majorinum apud Carthaginem ordinavit episcopum. Cui Majorino Donatus alius in eadem divisione successit, qui eloquentia sua sic confirmavit hanc hæresim, ut multi existiment, propter ipsum potius eos Donatistas vocari. Exstant scripta ejus, ubi apparet eum etiam non Catholicam de Trinitate habuisse sententiam: sed quamvis ejusdem substantiæ, minorem tamen Patre Filium, & minorem Filio putasse Spiritum Sanctum. Verum in hunc, quem de Trinitate habuit, ejus errorem, Donatistarum multitudo intenta non fuit. Nec facile in eis quisquam, qui hoc illum sensisse noverit, invenitur. Isti hæretici in urbe Roma Montenses vocantur, quibus hinc ex Africa solent episcopum mittere: aut hinc illuc Afri episcopi eorum pergere, si forte ibi eum ordinare placuisset.—Aug. Hær. 69.

's article
h whom
as it has
the party
reaster.
a schism,
Carthage
ld never
ained by
ir conti-
r notion
, or ra-
dges of
out the
Every
y com-
n them
hat the
a, who
under
ition to
Which
by his
think
ngs of.
old the
llowed
inferior

episcopis,
ordinavit
tus alius
oquentia
ut multi
os Dona-
ubi ap-
de Tri-
quamvis
en Patre
Spiritus
e Trini-
tistiarum
facile in
se nove-
Roma
Africa
ne illuc
orte ibi
r. 69.

‘ to the Father, and the Holy Spirit inferior to the Son. But
‘ in this he is not generally followed by the Donatists: nor are
‘ there many, who are aware, that this was his sentiment.
‘ These heretics are called Mountaineers at Rome, to whom
‘ they are wont to send a bishop from Africa, or else some
‘ African bishops go thither, if they have a mind he should be
‘ ordained there.’

Augustine has in another place^c taken notice of Donatus’s opinion concerning the doctrine of the Trinity.

II. I do by no means intend to write at large the history of the Donatists; I omit intirely their practice of re-baptizing. I shall only take some notice of the subject matter, or ground and reason of the difference between the catholics and them: and then observe the rise and occasion of this controversy. For other particulars I refer to divers writers, ‘ ancient, and ‘ modern.

1. At the beginning of his article just transcribed, Augustine mentions two objections of the Donatists against Cæcilian; one taken from crimes which he himself was said to be guilty of, the other is, that he was ordained by traitors. What the crimes were, which they accused Cæcilian himself of, may be seen in a passage of an anonymous Donatist writer, which^f I put at the bottom of the page. Whence it appears, that they also charged Mensurius, Cæcilian’s predecessor, with betraying the scriptures. The whole story is indeed very unlikely: nevertheless it was not forgot^g by the Donatists in the conference at Carthage in 411.

^c Ariani Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti diversas substantias esse dicunt. Donatistæ autem non hoc dicunt, sed unam Trinitatis substantiam consistuntur. Et si aliqui ipsorum minorem Filium esse dixerunt quam Pater est, ejusdem tamen substantiæ non negarunt. — Nec ipsa cum illis vertitur quæstio, sed de sola communione infelicitur litigant. Ep. 85. al. 50. cap. 1.

^d Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. x. c. vi. p. 391, 392. De Vit. Const. l. ii. c. 66. Opat. de Schism. Donatist. Aug. Opp. T. ix. Ed. Bened. & passim. Philast. H. 83. Theodoret. H. F. l. iv. c. 6.

^e Vid. H. Vales. de Sch. Donatist. ad calc. Annot. ad Euseb. H. E. Ittig. ad calc. Append. De Hæsiarchis. Leydeck. Hist. Ec. African. Witsii Diss. de Sch. Donat. ap. Misc. Sacr. T. i. p. 742. &c. Vitringa de Commun. Christian. Observ. Sacr. T. i. p. 742. &c. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. vi. H. Norisii Hist. Donatist. ap. Opp.

T. iv.

^f — Maxime cum etiam Mensurius Carthaginiensis quondam episcopus recenti scripturarum prodicione pollutus, sceleris sui amentiam pejore cæpisset ferocia publicare. Quippe qui combustorum veniam librorum a martyribus poscere atque implorare debuerat, ut delicta sua majoribus flagitiis cumularet, eo animo sæviebat in martyres, quo divinas tradiderat leges. Etenim hic, tyranno sævior, carnifice crudelior, idoneum sceleris sui ministerium diaconum suum elegit Cæcilianum. Idemque lora & flagra cum armatis ante fores carceris ponit, ut ab ingressu atque aditu cunctos, qui victum potumque in carcerem martyribus afferebant, gravi affectos injuria propulsaret. Et Cædebantur a Cæciliano passim qui ad alendos martyres veniebant. — &c. Acta Martyr. Saturnin. & alior. cap. xvii. ap. Du Pin Optat. p. 156.

^g Tunc Donatistæ aliquantulum prælocuti sunt, quod Mensurius, qui fuerat

Cæcilian’s

Cæcilian's faulty ordination was always one ^a pretence. And, if Optatus may be relied upon, the only complaint, which the Donatists at first made against Cæcilian, was, that ¹ he had been ordained by Felix of Apthonga, who, they said, delivered up the scriptures to persecutors: whilst the catholics ^k always denied the charge, as groundless.

Augustine, as we have seen, farther assures us, their opinion was, that the church of Christ subsisted in Africa only among themselves; and that every where else the church of Christ was lost and ruined, by communicating with unworthy persons, particularly, with such as adhered to Cæcilian, who had been ordained by traitors.

With what warmth and bitterness they expressed themselves upon this head, appears from ¹ a passage of an author of theirs, whom I have quoted more than once: as also from a place of ^m Petilian, in Augustine.

Augustine himself has mentioned a remarkable instance of their disdain of ⁿ other men, which I suppose may be relied upon.

But though the Donatists scrupled to communicate with the catholics, because they were traitors of the divine scriptures, the catholics ^o retorted the charge, and called the Donatists the

ante Cæcilianum ecclesie Carthaginis episcopus, tempore persecutionis tradiderit persecutoribus sanctas scripturas, &c. August. Brev. Collat. D. iii. cap. xiii. n. 23.

^h Dicunt ordinatorem ejus sanctos libros tradidisse. Aug. Psalm. Contr. Donat. D.

ⁱ Illo tempore a tot inimicis nihil in eum potuit confingi: sed de ordinatore suo, quod ab iis falso traditor diceretur, meruit infamari. Optat. l. i. c. 19.

^k Deinde Gesta Proconsularia, ubi Felix diligentissimo examine probatus est innocens. Aug. Ep. 43. al. 162. c. 2. n. 5. Vid. Gesta Purgationis Felicis Aptungitani.

^l Igitur cum hæc ita sint, quisnam est divini juris peritita pollens, — qui judicii Dei memor — separat a flante lapsus, ab integro vulneratum, a iusto reum, ab innocente damnatum, a custode legis proditorem, a confessore Christi nominis ejus negatorem — & unum atque idem existimet & ecclesiam martyrum & conventicula traditorum. — Quamobrem fugienda bonis, & vitanda est semper religiosi conspiratio traditorum, hypocritarum domus. — Denique isti falsi sacrorum ritus fictaque mysteria non tam in salutem quam in perniciem miserorum celebrantur, cum erigit altare sacrilegus, celebrat sacramenta profanus, baptizat reus, curat vulneratus, — legit evangelia traditor, hæreditatem cæli pro-

mittit divinorum testamentorum exulsor. Acta Saturnini, &c. cap. 19. ap. Du Pin Optat. p. 150.

^m Qui utique spiritus — sanctus in vos venire non potuit, quos non vel pœnitentia baptismus abluir: sed pœnitenda, quod verum est, aqua polluit traditoris. Aug. Contr. Lit. Petil. l. ii. c. 36. n. 83.

ⁿ Usque adeo ex ipso numero sunt, ut nuper in Collatione nostra, quod etiam in gestis ipsis legere potestis, cum eis a cognitore esset confessus oblati, ut sederent nobiscum, respondendum putarunt: Scriptum est nobis, cum talibus non sedere, scilicet ne per contactum subfelli-orum ad eos velut nostra contagio perveniret. Aug. Serm. 99. cap. 8. Tom. v. p. 524. E.

^o Ipsi tradiderunt libros, & nos audent accusare.

Aug. Psalm. contr. Donat. B. Dixerunt majores nostri, & libros fecerunt inde,

Qui tunc causam cognoverunt, quod recent possent probare.

Erant quidam traditores librorum de sancta lege, &c. D.

Sed hoc libenter finxerunt, quod se noverrunt fecisse. Ib. E.

Quicquid invicem objicimus de traditione codicum divinorum, de thurificatione. Id. De Unit. Ec. cap. ii.

Deinde non post longum tempus iidem

children

ce. And, which the had been vered up ways de-

r opinion y among of Christ rthy per- who had

emselves of theirs, place of

stance of ed upon. with the riptures, atists the

m exultor. p. Du Pia que spiritus otuit, quos abluit: sed qua polluit Petil. l. ii. leo ex ipso one nostra, re potestis, us oblatu, dum puta- alibus non n subfelli- o perveni- om. v. p. unt libros,

Donat. B. s fecerunt

od recens

de sancta

se nove-

traditione. Id.

us iidem children

children of traitors, and averred, that they who were the first authors of the separation, were themselves traitors.

2. This shall suffice for a brief account of the ground of this difference, which had its rise after this manner :

Mensurius bishop of Carthage being dead, and Maxentius giving liberty to the Christians in Africa in 311. Cæcilian was chosen in his room, and ordained by Felix of Aphthonga, and others. But some being dissatisfied, Majorinus^r was chosen and ordained by another party, afterwards called Donatists, from Donatus, bishop of Casæ Nigræ in Numidia, who was exceeding active in the support of that interest. About this time, therefore, we may date the beginning of this difference.

Soon after that Constantine became master of Africa, upon the defeat of Maxentius, the Donatists sent a request to the emperor, by Anulinus proconsul of Africa, desiring that their cause might be^a heard and examined by some bishops of Gaul, who had lived under his father Constantius : and not having been persecuted, as other Christians had been in other parts of the world, were free from the charge of betraying the scriptures, and like faults, which many others had been guilty of.

The emperor received this petition in Gaul, and^r soon sent back orders to Anulinus. He likewise wrote a letter to Miltiades bishop of Rome. The emperor's appointment was, that^r Majorinus with ten of his friends, and Cæcilian with ten

ipsi, tot & tales, ad Carthaginem profecti traditores, thurati, —Majorinum—post ordinationem Cæciliani ordinaverunt, schisma facientes. Et quoniam traditionis reos principes vestros fuisse, monstratum est. Optat. l. i. c. 15.

Si traditoribus non licet, vobis licere non debuit, quorum principes probamus fuisse traditores. Id. ib. cap. 5.

Paulo ante docuimus vestros parentes fuisse traditores & schismaticos : & tu ipso- rum hæres. —Omnia igitur, quæ a te in traditores & schismaticos dici potuerunt, vestra sunt. Id. l. i. c. 28.

Nec dicatur ad excusationem, quia traditoribus communicare noluerunt: cum manifestissime probatum sit, eosdem ipsos filios fuisse traditorum. Id. l. iii. c. 8. p. 65. Vid. & l. ii. c. 1. in. & l. v. c. 1. in.

Hoc apud Carthaginem post ordinationem Cæciliani factum esse, nemo est qui nesciat. Optat. l. i. c. 17. Tempestas persecutionis peracta & definita est. Jubente Deo, indulgentiam mittente Maxentio Christianis libertas est restituta. cap. 18. Et Majorinus, qui lector in diaconio Cæci-

liani fuerat, domesticus Lucillæ, ipsa suffragante, episcopus ordinatus est a traditoribus. Ib. cap. 19.

^a Nam majores vestri —imperatorem Constantium, harum rerum adhuc ignarum, his precibus rogaverunt. —Constantine, optime imperator, quoniam de genere justo es, cujus pater inter cæteros imperatores persecutionem non exercuit, & ab hoc facinore immunis est Gallia. Nam in Africa inter nos & cæteros episcopos contentiones sunt. Petimus, ut de Gallia nobis judices dari præcipiat pietas tua. Optat. l. i. c. 22. Vid. & August. Ep. 88. al. 65. ^r Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. x. c. 6. & Collat. Carth. D. 3. c. 116. & August. Brev. Col. D. 3. cap. vii. & xii.

^r Et tamen dari sunt judices, Maternus ex Agrippina civitate, Reticius ab Augustoduno civitate, Marinus Arelatenfis. Ad urbem Romam ventum est ab his tribus Gallis, & ab aliis quindecim Italis. Optat. l. i. c. 23. His decem & novem confidentibus episcopis, causa Donati & Cæciliani in medium missa est. c. 24.

others,

others, favourers of him, should appear at Rome before Mil-
tiades, and three bishops of Gaul. These were Maternus
bishop of Cologne, Reticius of Autun, and Marinus of Arles.
There were besides in this council fifteen Italian bishops, whose
names may be seen in Optatus, making in all nineteen. This
hearing was in the year 313. and Cæcilian^t was acquitted by the
unanimous vote of the council.

The Donatists not being yet satisfied, intreated the emperor,
that their cause might be taken into farther consideration. In
compliance with their request, was appointed the council of
Arles, which sat in 314. when a like judgment was again passed.

Still the Donatists were uneasy, and made^u fresh applications
to Constantine, to examine the affair himself. Which he con-
sented to, and after all decided, as the ecclesiastical judges had
done already. This hearing before the emperor was at^v Mi-
lain in 316. But^v the Donatists did not acquiesce any more
in the judgment now passed than in the former.

Thus the difference was fixed: there was no reconciling the
two parties. There was however a famous conference held at
Carthage in 411. between the catholics and Donatists: by
which, and by the writings of Augustine about that time, the
Donatists seem to have been much weakened. Nevertheless,
they subsisted in Africa till the end of the sixth century, or^v
later.

3. The Donatists were very numerous; there must have
been many of them in Numidia, and the proconsular province
of Africa. Augustine intimates, that^a though there were Do-

^t Cæcilianus omnium supra memorato-
rum sententiis innocens est pronunciatus.
Optat. l. i. c. 25. ^u Deinde diximus,
aliquanto post Majorini ordinationem, quem
contra Cæcilianum nefario scelere levave-
runt—eos petisse a Constantino tunc im-
peratore iudices episcopos, qui de suis
quæstionibus, quæ in Africa exortæ—
arbitrio medio judicarent. Quod postea
quam factum est, præsentem Cæciliano & illis
qui adversus eum navigaverant, judicante
Melchiade tunc Romanæ urbis episcopo cum
collegis suis, quos ad preces Donatistarum
miserat imperator, in Cæcilianum nihil po-
tuisse, ac per hoc illo in episcopatu confir-
mato.—Quibus peractis rebus cum illi
omnes in pertinacia—permanerent, post
apud Arelatum memoratum Imperatorem
eamdem causam diligentius examinandam
—curasse. Illos vero ab ecclesiastico
iudicio provocasse, ut causam Constantinus
audiret. Quo postea quam ventum est, utra-

que parte assistente, innocentem Cæcili-
anum fuisse judicatum, atque illos recessisse
superatos, & in eadem perversitate mansisse.
Aug. Ep. 43. al. 162. c. 2. n. 4. Conf.
libr. post Collat. cap. 33. Vid. Aug. Ep.
105. al. 166. n. 8. Ep. 129. n. 4. & 185.
al. 50. c. 2. n. 6. Ep. 89. n. 3. Et reci-
tatum est iudicium Constantini.—Aug.
Brev. Coll. D. 3. c. 19. in. Vid. & Mo-
numenta Vetera ap. Du Pin Optat. p. 188.

^x Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. A. 316. n.
xiv. xv. ^y Responderunt, etiam im-
peratorias aures pravis suggestionibus in-
stos. Aug. Brev. Coll. D. 3. cap. 19.

^z Vid. Vales. de Schisin. Donat. cap. ult.
fin.

^a Quod enim propterea se uni-
versos adesse dixerunt, & eorum numerus
appareat, quoniam eos paucos esse adver-
sarii sui sæpe mentiti sunt. Hoc si aliquando
a nostris dictum est, de his locis dici veri-
sime potuit, ubi nostrorum coepiscoporum
& clericorum & laicorum longe major est
natists

natists in many places, yet in most cities, except those of Numidia, the catholics were much more numerous than they.

At the fore-mentioned conference at Carthage, were present 286 catholic bishops: the Donatists counted^b but 279, and some of them absent. Tychonius^c speaks of a council of Donatists at Carthage, consisting of 270 bishops, but the time of it is uncertain. Augustine often speaks of a council of theirs, about the year 394, consisting^d of 310 bishops; and all these 310 were friends of Primianus: if the Maximianists, who were absent, were 100, their number in the whole were 410.

For certain, this unhappy difference among the Christians of Africa affords an admonition to all men, to respect and hearken to Solomon's observation, and the council founded upon it; Prov. xvii. 14. *The beginning of strife is, as when one lets out water. Therefore leave off contention, before it be meddled with.*

4. I forbear to enter into an account of the persecutions suffered by the Donatists. They were restrained by the imperial laws, which sometimes were very severe; but they^e were rarely executed in their utmost rigour. And the Donatists, who were not free from differences among themselves, often^f shewed great bitterness toward each other: and in places where they were superior in number, they^g bore hard upon the catholics.

III. I add a brief account of some Donatist writers.

It ought to be observed, that I have already transcribed Jerom's article of Donatus, bishop of Carthage next after Majo-

nerus, & maxime in Proconsulari Provincia. Quamquam excepta Numidia Consulari etiam in cæteris provinciis Africanis, nostrorum numero facillime superantur. Aug. Ep. 199. n. E.

^b Respondit Officium, nomina Donatistarum episcoporum esse ducenta septuaginta novem, annumeratis etiam illis, pro quibus absentibus alii subscripserant. Catholicorum autem omnium præsentium nomina esse consuevit ducenta octoginta sex. Aug. Brev. D. 1. cap. 14.

^c Dicit enim Tychonius, homo, ut dixi, vestre communionis, a ducentis & septuaginta vestris episcopis concilium Carthagini celebratum. Aug. Ep. 93. al. 48. cap. x. n. 43.

^d Sed ecce damnauerunt in concilio suo Maximianistas trecenti decem episcopi Donatistæ. Contr. Ep. Petil. l. i. c. 11. n. 18. Sic enim eos describunt trecenti decem plenarii concilii. Contr. Ep. Parmen. l. ii. c. 3. n. 7. Vid.

& contr. Crescon. l. iii. c. 52. n. 58. & c. 53, 54, 56. & passim. ^e Quæ res coegit tunc primum adversus vos allegari apud Vicarium Serranum legem illam de decem libris auri, quas nullus vestrum adhuc pendit, & nos crudelitatis arguitis. Contr. Lit. Petil. l. ii. c. 83. n. 184.

^f Ita cæci & insani, ut cum schismaticos suos Maximianistas per potestates a Catholicis Imperatoribus missas de basilicis excluderint, & vi magna iussionum & auxiliorum cedere sibi compulerint, arguant Catholicam, si pro ea Catholici principes tale aliquid fieri præceperit. Contr. Parm. l. i. c. 10. n. 16.

^g Nonne apud Hipponem, ubi ego sum, non defunt, qui meminerint, Faustinum vestrum regni sui tempore præcipisse, quoniam Catholicorum ibi paucitas erat, ut nullus eis panem coqueret? &c. Contr. Petil. l. ii. c. 83. n. 184.

rinus: from whom, as some supposed, the party had its denomination.

1. Anonymous ^h author of the Acts of Saturninus, Felix, Dativus, Ampelius, and others; which appear to have been written not long after ^l the beginning of the fourth century.

2. Cresconius, a learned ^k grammarian among the Donatists, wrote a book against the first part of Augustine's confutation of Petilian: which Augustine answered in four books, still extant, written in 406.

3. Gaudentius, ^l bishop of Tamugada in Numidia. He was one of the seven Donatist bishops, chosen to defend their cause at the conference at Carthage in 411. Some time after that conference, the tribune Dulcitius, who was the emperor's commissary for executing the imperial laws against the Donatists, sent an admonition to him, to return to the unity of the catholic church. Which Gaudentius answered, first by a short, then by a long letter. Dulcitius having sent those letters to Augustine, he answered them in one book. Gaudentius published a defence of his letters; and Augustine replied in another, or second book.

That is the substance of what Augustine himself writes. By which it appears, that Cave's account of this matter is not quite right: who ^m supposeth, Augustine to have written three books against Gaudentius.

Gaudentius seems to have been a man of a violent temper: for ⁿ he had formed a design to set fire to his church, and therein to burn himself and some others. The only apology that can be made is, that the hard usage the Donatists met

^h Extant ap. Baluz. Misc. T. ii. p. 56. &c. & Optat. Milev. ex Edit. Du Pin. p. 150. &c. ⁱ Vid. Baluz. Monitum.

^k Grammaticus etiam quidam Donatista Cresconius, cum invenisset epistolam meam, quâ primas partes, quæ in manus nostras tunc venerant epistolæ Petiliani, redargui, putavit mihi esse respondendum, & hoc ipsum scripsit ad me. Cui operi ejus libris quatuor respondi. Retract. l. ii. c. 26.

^l Per idem tempus Dulcitius tribunus & notarius: hic erat exsecutor imperialium jussionum contra Donatistas datarum. Qui cum dedisset literas ad Gaudentium Tamugadensem Donatistam episcopum, unum illorum septem, quos in nostra collatione auctores suæ defensionis elegerant, exhortatus cum ad unitatem catholicam, & dissuadens incendium, quo se ac suos cum ipsa in qua erat ecclesia consumere minabatur. — Ille rescripsit epistolas duas, unam

breve[m]—aliâ[m] prolixam. — Has mihi supra memoratus tribunus existimavit esse mittendas, ut eas potius ipse resellerem: quas ambas uno libro redargui. Qui cum in ejusdem Gaudentii pervenisset manus, rescripsit quod ei visum est, ad me ipsum. — Hinc factum est, ut hi nostri ad illum duo libri essent. Aug. Retr. l. ii. c. 59. Conf. Opp. T. ix. sub fin.

^m Gaudentium episcopum Tamugadensem sectæ Donatistæ, qui Dulcitio tribuno Imperatoris apud Africam legato duas epistolas apologeticas obtulit, ab Augustino totidem libris refutatus: quibus responsum opposuit Gaudentius, ab Augustino itidem libro tertio eversum. Cav. H. L. De Gaudentio Brixienfi.

ⁿ Gaudentius, — cum seipsum in ecclesia quibusdam sibi adjunctis perditis incendiare minabatur. Aug. Contr. Gaud. l. i. c. i. Vid. ejusd. Retract. supr. not. l.

with made them desperate, and filled them with a rage, which they were not able to govern.

I have placed Gaudentius as flourishing about the year 411, the time of the fore-mentioned conference; but his letters to Dulcitius, and his answer to Augustine's first book, were not written until some good while after: for Augustine's writings in this controversy are supposed to have been published about the year 420.

4. Says Gennadius, in the chapter next following in his Catalogue that of Vitellius, to be hereafter transcribed: 'Macrobius' also, a presbyter among the Donatists; and afterwards their secret bishop at Rome, whilst he was yet a presbyter of the church of God, wrote one book addressed to confessors and virgins; a work of the moral kind, but very useful, especially for preserving chastity. He first flourished among us in Africa, and afterwards among the Donatists, or Mountaineers, at Rome.'

Macrobius was the fourth ^p Donatist bishop, who sat at Rome, and was living when Optatus of Milevi wrote, about 370. Optatus may be relied upon for that. But whether Gennadius be in the right in saying, that Macrobius was first a presbyter among the catholics, may be questioned. Nor is it easy to form a clear conception concerning the occasion, which a catholic presbyter should have about that time to write an exhortation to confessors. Inasmuch, that it may be doubted, whether Gennadius did not confound two persons of this name. Tillemont ^q has good remarks upon this account of Gennadius.

There is still extant a piece, intitled ^r The Passion of Maximian and Isaac, Donatists: which is generally supposed to ^s have been written by the above-named Donatist bishop Macrobius, in the year 348, or 349.

5. Parmenian succeeded ^t Donatus in the see of Carthage

^o Macrobius, presbyter & ipse, ut ex scriptis Optati cognovimus, Donatista, & suorum pestes in urbe Roma oculus episcopus fuit. Scripsit, cum adhuc in ecclesia Dei presbyter fuisset, ad confessores & ad virgines librum unum, moralis quidem, sed valde necessariae doctrinae, & praecipue ad custodiendam castitatem antissimis valde sententis communitum. Claruit inter nostros primum Africae, & inter suos, id est Donatianos, sive Montenses, postea Romae. Gennad. De V. I. cap. v.

^p Ergo restat, ut fateatur socius vester Macrobius se illi federe, ubi aliquando sedet Encol-

pius.—Optat. l. ii. c. 4.

Donatistes. Note 21.

^r Apud Du Pin Optat. p. 109. &c.

^s See Tillem. Donatistes Art. 48.

^t Non enim Cæcilianus exivit a Majorino avo tuo.

Optat. l. i. c. 15.

In tribus libris contra epistolam Parmeniani Donatistarum Carthaginensis episcopi, successoremque Donati. Aug. Retr. l. ii. c. 17.

Dicant, unde natus est Majorinus, aut Donatus, ut per eos nasceretur Parmenianus atque Primitianus. Aug. Cont. Parm. l. iii. c. 2. n. 11. Vid. & c. 3. n. 18.

about the ^u year 350. Not long before the year 370. he wrote a book or epistle against the catholics, which was soon after answered by Optatus of Milevi, in a work still extant.

Parmenian afterwards wrote another letter against ^{*} Tichonius a Donatist, who differed in some things from the rest of his party. This letter was answered by Augustine in three books.

It does not appear with certainty, when ⁷ this letter of Parmenian was published: but Augustine's answer was written about the year 400, and Parmenian was then dead. He seems however to have lived to the year ^z 390, and the Donatist interest flourished greatly under him.

6. Petilian, bishop of Cirtha, called also Constantina, in Numidia: who ^a formerly pleaded at the bar as an advocate, wrote a letter to the Donatist clergy, which Augustine soon after answered ^b in three books. He was one of the seven Donatist bishops, appointed to defend their cause at the famous conference at Carthage.

7. Says Gennadius, who wrote near the end of the fifth century, ' Tichonius ^c of Africa, well acquainted with the literal sense of scripture, and not ignorant in secular learning, and well versed in ecclesiastical affairs, wrote three books concerning intestine divisions, an Exposition of several matters [or a Miscellany], in which works he mentions some ancient synods in defence of his own cause. By all which it appears, he was of the Donatist party. He wrote also a book of Seven Rules, for attaining the true Meaning of Scripture. He likewise wrote a Commentary upon the Revelation of John, from the beginning to the end.

That is a part of Gennadius's article: for the rest I refer to himself.

Augustine in his answer to Parmenian gives Tichonius ^d the character of a man of good sense, and a great deal of eloquence.

^u Vid. Du Pin Præf. ad Optat. & Tillem. Les Donatistes Art. L. fin.

^{*} Nunc autem quoniam incidit in manus nostras Parmeniani quondam episcopi eorum quædam epistola, quæ scribitur ad Tichonium. Aug. contr. Parmen. l. i. c. 1. Conf. Aug. Ep. 93. n. 44.

⁷ Se Tillem. Donatistes. Art. 59.

^z Id. ib. Art. 63.

^a Vid. Aug. contr. Petil. l. iii. c. 16.

^b Opp. T. ix.

^c Tichonius, natione Afer, in divinis literis eruditus, juxta historiam sufficienter, & in secularibus non ignarus fuit, in ecclesiasticis quoque negotiis studiosus. Scripsit de bello intestino libros tres, & expositiones diver-

farum causarum, in quibus ob suorum defensionem antiquarum meminit synodorum. E quibus omnibus agnoscitur Donatiane partis fuisse. Composuit & Regulas ad investigandam & inveniendam intelligentiam scripturarum septem, quas in uno volumine conclusit. Expofuit & Apocalypsin Johannis ex integro, nihil in eo carnale, sed totum intelligens spirituale. Gennad. De V. l. c. 18.

^d — incidit in manus nostras Parmeniani — epistola, quæ scribitur ad Tichonium, hominem quidem & acri ingenio præditum, & uberi eloquio, sed Donatistam. Aug. Contr. Parm. l. i. c. 1.

He was a moderate Donatist. But then he^a is reckoned inconsistent: and he fell under the displeasure of his own party. Parmenian, bishop of Carthage, as we have seen, wrote against him. Du Pin says, he^f flourished about the year 380. Tillemont's^g computation is not very different. The book of the Civil War, or Intestine Divisions, may be the book referred to by Augustine, and against which Parmenian wrote. The Seven Rules for finding the true Meaning of Scripture are^h still extant.

8. 'Vitellius, of Africa,' saysⁱ Gennadius, 'defending the schism of the Donatists, wrote a book, shewing, that the servants of God are hated by the world. In which, if he had not treated us as persecutors, he delivered an excellent doctrine. He also wrote against the Gentiles, and against us, as traitors of the divine scriptures in the persecution. He likewise wrote several other books, relating to ecclesiastical discipline. He flourished under Constans, son of the emperor Constantine:' that is, as Cave computes, about the year 344.

As Gennadius's is the only account we have of this author, and none of his writings remain, nothing farther can be added. We may however conclude from hence, that the Donatists were not concerned for the interests of their own party only: but employed themselves likewise in the defence of the common cause of Christianity against its enemies.

IV. The Donatists used the same scriptures that other Christians did: as is often owned by their catholic adversaries, ^kOptatus and ^lAugustine.

1. That they received all the several parts of the Old and

^a Tichonius—vidit ecclesiam Dei toto orbe diffusam.—Aug. ibid. Conf. ejusd. Ep. 93. c. x. n. 43.

^f Hist. Donat. p. 12.

^g Les Donatistes Art. 59. & note 31, 32.

^h App. Bibb. PP. Mex. T. vi.

ⁱ Vitellius Afer, Donatianorum schisma defendens, scripsit de eo quod odio sint mundo servi Dei. In quo si tacuisset de nostro velut persecutorum nomine, egregiam doctrinam ediderat. Scripsit & adversum Gentes, & adversum nos velut traditores, in persecutione, divinarum scripturarum. Et ad regulam ecclesiasticam pertinentia multa differuit. Claruit sub Constante filio Constantini principis. Gennad. cap. iv.

^k Cum constet merito, quia nobis & vobis ecclesiastica una est conversatio.—Denique pos-

sumus & nos dicere: Pares credimus, & uno sigillo signati sumus, nec aliter baptizati quam vos. Testamentum divinum legimus pariter. Optat. l. iii. c. 9.

Denique & apud vos & apud nos una est ecclesiastica conversatio, communes lectiones, eadem fides.—Id. l. v. c. 1. fin.

^l Proferte certe aliquem de scripturis canonicis, quarum nobis est communis auctoritas, ab hæreticis venientem denuo baptizatum. Aug. contr. Crescon. l. i. c. 31. n. 37.

In scripturis discimus Christum: in scripturis discimus ecclesiam. Has scripturas communiter habemus. Ep. 105. al. 166. c. 4. n. 14.

Isti autem fratres utriusque testamenti auctoritate devincti sunt. Ep. 129. n. 3.

New Testament, appears from St. ^m Augustine's enumeration of them in his arguments with these people.

2. There can be no question therefore, but they received all those books in particular, which were generally received.

3. The book of the Acts is largely quoted by ⁿ Petilian, and ^{*} Tichonius.

4. I cannot say, whether they received the Epistle to the Hebrews. Tichonius has the words ^p of Heb. x. 38. *The just shall live by faith*; but he seems to consider them as the prophet Habakkuk's.

5. They plainly received the Revelation of St. John. Augustine frequently ^q quotes it in his arguments with them. It is also cited by the ^r Anonymous Author of the Acts of Saturninus and others. Tichonius ^{*} the Donatist wrote a Commentary upon the whole book, as we before saw in his article from Gennadius.

6. Augustine bears witness to them, that ^t they had the like respect for the scriptures that the catholics had, and were not unwilling to be determined by them.

Moreover, their respect for the divine scriptures was manifest, in their aversion for all those who had betrayed them, or were supposed to have done so.

^m Non invidemus alicui. Legite nobis hoc de Lege, de Prophetis, de Psalmis, de ipso Evangelio, de Apostolicis literis. Legimus, & credimus. Aug. de Unit. Ecc. cap. 6. n. 11.

Ut ergo non commemorem gentes, quæ post apostolorum tempora crediderunt, & accesserunt ecclesiæ. Illæ ipsæ solæ, quas in sanctis literis, in Actibus, & Epistolis Apostolorum, & Apocalypsi Johannis invenimus: quas utrique amplectimur, & quibus utrique subdimur, &c. Ib. c. 12. n. 31.

Sed in præscripto Legis, in Prophetarum prædictis, in Psalmorum cantibus, in ipsius Pastoris vocibus, in Evangelistarum prædicationibus & laboribus, hoc est in omnibus sanctorum librorum auctoritatibus. Ib. c. 18. n. 47.

Quas utique scripturas, nisi canonicas Legis & Prophetarum? Huc accesserunt Evangelia, Apostolica Epistola, Actus Apostolorum, Apocalypsis Joannis. Ib. c. 19. n. 51.

Quod non de Lege, non de Propheta, non de Psalmo, non de Apostolo, non de Evangelio,—recitatis. Ep. 105. al. 166. c. 1. n. 2.

ⁿ Sed ut hæc ab apostolis præluceant, eorum Actibus edocemur. Petilian. ap.

Aug. contr. Lit. Pet. l. ii. c. 37. n. 85. Vid. ib. c. 20. n. 44. & c. 21. n. 47.

^o Tichon. Reg. iii. p. 52. Bib. PP. T. 6.

^p Quomodo autem ex lege nemo justificatur apud Deum: justus autem ex fide vivit. [Conf. Gal. iii. 11.] Ostendit præterea, dictum esse per Prophetam, ex fide vivit. Tich. Reg. iii. ap. Bib. PP. T. vi. p. 39. F.

^q Nam populos significat aliquando vocabulo aquarum, legant in Apocalypsi.—Sic enim dicitur Joanni.—Aug. contr. Ep. Parmen. l. ii. c. 10. n. 22. Vid. ib. n. 20. Et conf. Aug. contr. Crescon. l. iii. c. 66. n. 75. & c. 67. n. 77.

^r Et hanc sententiam suam Sancti Spiritus auctoritate conscriptam tibi comparatione firmabant. Scriptum est, inquit, in Apocalypsi.—Acta Saturnin. &c. cap. 18.

^s Exposuit & Apocalypsin ex integro. Gennad. De V. l. cap. 18.

^t Sed ut dicere ceperam, non audiamus: Hæc dicis, hæc dico. Sed audiamus: Hæc dicit Dominus. Sunt certe libri dominici, quorum auctoritatibus utrique consentimus, utrique cedimus, utrique servimus. De Unit. Ec. c. 3. n. 5.

Sileant humanarum contentionum animosa & perniciosa certamina. Inclinemus aurem verbo Dei. ib. c. 7. n. 15.

C H A P. LXVIII.

ALEXANDER, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA.

I. His history and works. II. His testimony to the scriptures.

I. ALEXANDER, bishop of Alexandria, succeeded * Achillas in the year 312, or 313. In his time arose the Arian controversy, which made so much noise in the world. He was present at the council of Nice in 325, and died at Alexandria, before the end of that year, or some time in 326, within five months ^b after the breaking up of the council, or ^c after his return home from it.

By Theodoret he is called ^d the great Alexander, and ^e an excellent defender of the evangelical doctrine.

It is not known, that Alexander wrote any thing beside epistles, sent to bishops in several parts of the world: which, as ^f Epiphanius says, were in number almost seventy, and were extant in his time in the hands of the curious. Socrates says, that ^g great numbers of epistles having been written by many, sent chiefly to the bishop of Alexandria, collections were made of them; one by Arius, of those favouring him, another by Alexander, on the contrary side. It is probable, that ^h each collection contained the letters written by themselves, as well as by others in their favour. But, as may be argued from the words of Socrates, and is farther evident from ⁱ Sozomen, each collection consisted of letters written on one side only.

Of all those epistles of Alexander there now remain two only, one in Socrates, to ^k the bishops of the catholic church

* Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. & Pagi Crit. in Baron. Ann. 311. n. 25. ^b Alexander quinto post synodum habitam mense obiit, exeunte anno 325. vel mense primo infuentis anni. Cav. ib. in Alexandro.

^c Quo pæsto Alexander in suam ecclesiam initio hyemis pervenit, & die 16 Aprilis defunctus est. Quæ Athanasii laudati sententia fuisse videtur. Hæc enim ejus verba: Οὕτω δὲ πέντε μῆνες παρήλθον, καὶ ὁ μὲν μακάριος Ἀλεξάνδρος τελευτήσκειν id est, nondum quinque mensis (scilicet ab adventu Alexandri in ecclesiam suam,) præterierant, cum Alexander mortem obiit. Pagi ib. An. 326. n. 3. Conf. Ap. d. contr. Arian. n. 59. p. 178. & Thdræt. l. i. c. 26. ^d Hæc. Fab. l. iv. n. 1. p. 232. & n. 7. p. 239. ^e — Ἀλεξάνδρος

ἄνδρος ὁ γενναῖος τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν δογματῶν γενομένος προμαχός. Id. H. E. l. i. c. 2. p. 7. ^f — ὡς τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἑξήδη μνησθῆναι. Epiph. H. 69. n. 4.

^g Οὕτως ἐναντίων γραμματῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἐπισκοπῶν Ἀλεξανδρείας πεμπόμενων, ἀποποιήσαι τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τῶν συνταγῶν, ἀρείας μὲν τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, Ἀλεξάνδρος δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων. Socr. l. i. c. 6. f. ^h Non omittendum, quod Socrates narrat, Arium collectionem fecisse epistolarum causæ suæ faventium, in quibus non dubium est etiam Arii ipsius epistolas insertas fuisse. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. 8. p. 309. Vid. & p. 340.

ⁱ — συναβύσῃν ἐποίησαντο τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκίας αἰρέσεως φερομένων ἐπιστολῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐναντίας παρίλαβον. Sozom. l. i. c. 1. p. 402. A. ^k Τῆς ἀβασπύλλου — συλ-

throughout the world : the other in ¹ Theodoret, to Alexander bishop of Byzantium, with ^m fragments of some others. The time of writing those two letters will be shewn more particularly at the beginning of the next chapter.

It must be owned, that Alexander expresseth himself with much warmth, if not with bitterness of spirit.

He calls Arius and his followers ⁿ apostates, and ^{*} enemies of Christ, and ^f impious. He says, they ^s had done their utmost to exceed all past heresies, and approach nearer to Antichrist.

II. All the farther account, which I shall give of those two letters will relate to the holy scriptures.

1. It is observable, that several books of the New Testament, particularly St. Paul's epistles, are here frequently quoted.

2. St. John's gospel is largely and expressly quoted. 'John ^h the evangelist: John ¹ in his gospel: the ^k most excellent John.'

3. Alexander received the epistle to the Hebrews, as Paul's. 'As ¹ the apostle says, Jesus Christ, the ^m same yesterday, to-day, and for ever: and what reason have they to say, that he was made for us, when Paul writes, for ⁿ whom are all things, and by whom are all things.' Again, having cited divers texts, he adds, 'Agreeably ^o to these speaks the most eloquent Paul, saying, Whom ^p he has appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.' In another place ¹ he has words of Heb. i. 3.

4. He quotes the second Epistle of St. John, ver. 10. 'For ^e it becometh us as Christians, — not to say to such: God

ἀποστόλους τοὺς ἀπειλάχον τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Socr. l. i. c. 6. p. 10. A.

¹ Ap. Thdt. l. i. c. 4. ^m Vid.

Conf. Ap. l. viii. c. 28. in notis: & Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 341. & S. Maxim. Confess. T. ii. p. 159, 155. Conf. Car. H. L. in Alexandro.

ⁿ Εξήλθεν γὰρ ἀνδρὲς παρανομοὶ καὶ χριστομάχοι, διδασκοῦντες ἀποστασιᾶν. Ap. Socr. l. i. c. 6. p. 10. A. B.

— εὐσεβέσις — προεσταίαι καὶ τέλει τὴν ἀποστασίαν. ib. B. ^e Ἀπαξ γὰρ

προβλεπόμενοι χριστομάχουν. p. 112: B.

^f — Φασι οἱ ἀλαστορεῖ. ap. Th. p. 10. D.

^g — ἐδικαιώσαν ἐξ ἐαυτῶν ἐκείνας, ὡς

ἐγγύστεροι τοῦ ἀληθινῆς γενομένοι. p. 12. D.

^h — Ἰωάννης εὐαγγελιστὴς κ. λ. Ap.

Thdret. l. i. c. 4. p. 11. ⁱ Τίς

ἀκούων Ἰωάννη λέγειος — ; ἡ τίς ἀκούων

ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ — ; Ap. Socr. l. i. c.

6. p. 11. C. D. ^k Ο εὐλαβεστάτος Ἰωάννης. Ap. Theod. p. 12. A.

¹ Ἀλλ' ὡς ἀποστόλος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἔχει καὶ σημεῖον αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὰς αἰωνὰς τὴν ἀρὰν εἰπεῖν αὐτὸς ἐπεισιν, οἱ δὲ ἡμᾶς γινώσκουσιν καὶ τὸ Παῦλον γραφόντος, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' ὧν τὰ πάντα; ap. Socr. p. 12. B.

^m Heb. xiii. 8. ⁿ Heb. ii. 10.

^o Στρυφάνα γὰρ τῶν βλασφημιῶν καὶ οὐ μὴν λοφωστάτος Παῦλος, φασκὼν περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐβόηκε κληρονομοῦν τοῦ κόσμου. κ. λ. ap. Theod. p. 13. B.

^p Hebr. i. 2.

^q — ἀπαντᾶσθαι γὰρ ἐστὶ τῆς δοξῆς καὶ χαρμῆς τῆς πατρικῆς υποστάσεως. ap.

Th. p. 17. D. Vid. & Socr. p. 12. D.

^r — καὶ μὴ δὲ καὶ χαίρειν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις

λέγειν, ὥστε μὴ πᾶσι καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις αὐτῶν

κατανοῶν γενομένα, ὡς παροργιστὴν οὐ μακα-

ριος Ἰωάννης. ap. Socr. p. 13. C.

^s speed,

speed, lest we be partakers of their sins, as the blessed John directs.

5. I shall add some things, shewing his respect for the scriptures, and the general divisions then in use.

1.) He calls them^a divine scriptures. He ever asserts his own opinion upon the^a ground of their authority, and^a chargeth his adversaries with opposing and contradicting the same divine scriptures. The doctrines which he maintains to be true, he says, are apostolical, which^a we teach and preach, and for which we are ready to die.

2.) Other passages to the like purpose are such as these: 'We^a believe in one only unbegotten Father, giver of the^a law, and the prophets, and the gospels, Lord of the patri-^a archs, and apostles, and all holy men.' Afterwards, 'We^a also confess, as the divine scriptures teach, one Holy Spirit, who renewed both the holy men of the Old Testament, and the divine teachers of that which is called the New.' He thinks, that^a the hypostasis of the Son may be above the comprehension of evangelists, and even of angels. Having cited some texts of the Old Testament, and St. Paul's epistles, he proceeds, 'And^b in the gospel it is written.'

3.) I have not observed in Alexander quotations of any books, beside those of the Old and the New Testament. But representing in strong terms the perverseness of his adversaries, Arius and his adherents, he says: 'They^c have no regard to the wisdom and piety of ancient writings, nor to the unanimous consent of our colleagues in the doctrine concerning Christ.' By ancient writings, I suppose he means those of early Christians, near the days of the apostles: for which he seems to have had, and justly, a high respect. Nevertheless they were not esteemed decisive, and of authority in matters of religion. If they had been so, they would have been frequently quoted by him.

^a Εὐλογίᾳ τῆς ἡσυχίας ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς. ap. Socr. p. 10. A. & passim.

^b Καὶ ταῦτα λεγόμενα, καὶ ἀναπύσσοντες τὰς θείας γραφάς, πολλακίς ἀντιτίθενται αὐτῇ. ap. Socr. p. 12. C.

^c Ποία δὲ παρὰ τὰς γραφὰς ἐπιθυροῦντες λαλῶσιν, εἰς ταῦτα. Ap. Soc. p. 10. D. τὰς θείας—συναναιρῶντες γραφάς. ap. Th. p. 10. D. καὶ ταῖς γραφαῖς ἐμπαροινεῖς. ib. p. 11. B.

^d Ταῦτα διδάσκοντες, ταῦτα κηρύττουμεν, ταῦτα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰ ἀποστολικά δογμα-
τα, ὑπὲρ ὧν καὶ ἀποθνήσκουμεν. Ap. Th. p. 19. A. B.

^e Νόμον καὶ προφητῶν

καὶ εὐαγγελίων δόγματα, πατριάρχων καὶ ἀποστόλων καὶ ἀπαλίων ἁγίων κυρίων. Ap. Th. p. 17. A. B.

^f Καθὼς ἡμᾶς αἱ θείαι γραφαὶ διδάσκουσιν, ἐν πνεύμα ἁγίῳ ὁμολοῦμεν, τὸ καίνισαν τῆς τε τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης ἁγίας ἀνθρώπου, καὶ τῆς τῆς χρη-
μαλίσσης καὶ τῆς παιδείας θείας. Ib. p. 18. C. D.

^g Ib. p. 12. B. Conf. p. 17. C.

^h Ἐν δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. ib. p. 14. B.

ⁱ Οὐ καλῶσιν αὐτὴς ἡ τῶν ἀρχαίων γραφῶν φιλοθεῖος σαφήνεια· ἡ δὲ τῶν συλλεῖψέων συμφωνία περὶ Χριστοῦ εὐ-
λαβεία. ib. p. 16. C. Vid. ib. B.

C H A P. LXIX.

ARIUS, AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

I. *His history.* II. *His works.* III. *His charact.* IV. *The rise and occasion of the Arian controversy.* V. *The opinions of Arius and his followers.* VI. *Divisions among them, and their numerous councils and creeds.* VII. *Their want of moderation.* VIII. *Their testimony to the scriptures.* IX. *Arian writers:* 1. *Acacius.* 2. *Aëtius.* 3. *Anonymous author of a Commentary upon the Book of Job.* 4. *Another, author of a Discourse in Augustine.* 5. *Asterius.* 6. *Basil of Ancyra.* 7. *Eunomius.* 8. *Eusebius of Emesa.* 9. *Eusebius of Nicomedia.* 10. *Euzoius.* 11. *George of Laodicea.* 12. *Lucius.* 13. *Maximin.* 14. *Philostorgius.* 15. *Sabinus.* 16. *Theodore, bishop of Heraclea.* 17. *Ulpilas.*

I. THE history of the Arian controversy may be learned not only from Eusebius, Socrates, and Sozomen, and other ecclesiastical historians, but likewise from Arius himself, Alexander and Athanasius, principals in the debate.

It began, as some think, in the year ^a 316, others about ^b 319: whereas ^c Baronius placed it as early as 315, agreeably to ^d Orosius, as he thought. But ^e Basnage and others say, that the beginning of Arianism is put by that author in 317. Cave likewise thinks, that Arius was not known ^f as an heresiarch, until after 315, though he speaks of him as flourishing about that year. Bernard de Varenne says, that ^g Arius did not open himself fully, till the year 319, when he knew that he had several bishops and presbyters on his side.

Epiphanius informs us, it was said, that ^h Arius was a native of Libya: he does not speak positively. Constantine seems to mean Alexandria, when he speaks of ⁱ sending back Arius to his own country. It is now commonly said, that his father's name was Ammonius: and indeed, Arius sent his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia by one ^k Ammonius, whom he calls father. But in what sense he useth the word, may be questioned, as has been already observed by ^l Basnage.

^a Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 308.

^b Tillem. T. vi. Les Ariens. Art. 2. & Note i.

^c A. 315. n. 20.

^d I. vii. c. 28.

^e A. 317. n. v.

Conf. eund. A. 321. n. ix. & Pagi Ann. 315. n. vi. vii.

^f Cœpitque, ut

volunt, ab anno 315. tanquam hæresiarcha innotescere: quod tamen paulo serius mihi contigisse videtur, paucis ante synodum Nicænam annis. Cav. H. L. in Ario.

^g Histoire de Constantin. l. v. p. 207. a Paris. 1728.

^h — φασιν δὲ αὐτὸν

ἀπὸ τῆς γένει. Epiph. H. 6. g. n. 69.

ⁱ — ἐπὶ τὴν πατρίδα ἀφικέσθαι δυνά-

μεις. ap. Soer. l. i. c. 25. p. 61. B.

^k Ap. Epiph. H. 69. n. 6.

^l Sed ambiguum patris nomen, quod episcopis etiam frequentissime dabatur, in incerto ponit, naturæ an dignitate pater Arii vocetur Ammonius. Basn. A. 317. n. v.

Sozomen says, that^m Arius was made deacon by Peter, but was afterwards excommunicated by the same bishop, for not approving of his treatment of Meletius and his adherents. When Peter had suffered martyrdom, Achillas not only forgave Arius, and admitted him deacon again, but ordained him presbyter. After whose deathⁿ, he was also for a time much esteemed by Alexander.

It is universally agreed, that Arius was presbyter of Alexandria, and^{*} officiated in a church of that city. Theodoret says, he^p was intrusted with the interpretation of the sacred scriptures: whether Theodoret thereby means, as catechist, or only as preacher in the church allotted to him, is not^q certain. For it seems to me, that there is no good reason to conclude from these expressions of Theodoret, that Arius had the office of catechist at Alexandria.

Arius's particular opinions being known, and spreading considerably, Alexander convened a council at Alexandria: in which Arius and divers others were^r excommunicated, as Socrates says. To the like purpose Alexander himself^s, in his epistle to Alexander bishop of Byzantium, afterwards called Constantinople. Sozomen says, that^t Alexander excommunicated Arius and the clergy that followed him.

This sentence was passed upon Arius, as^u Tillemont thinks, in 319 or 320, or as other learned^v men, in 320 or 321. It appears to me very difficult to determine the year with certainty.

It ought to be observed, that about the year 319, or in some short time after, two synods were held at Alexandria. After the former of which Alexander wrote his letter to his name-sake at Constantinople; after the latter, at which were present almost^w a hundred bishops of Egypt and Libya, he wrote the letter to the bishops of the catholic church in all places. There seems not to have been any long space of time between those two synods: and both these letters of Alexander were written a good while before Constantine's letter to the same

^m Soz. l. i. c. 15. p. 426. A. B.

ⁿ ——— μιὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρος ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Soz. ib. B.

^o Vid. Epiph. H. 69. n. i.

^p Ἀρεῖος τῷ μὲν κατὰ λόγῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἐπιμαχόμενος, τῇ δὲ τῶν θεῶν γραφῶν πιστευόμενος ἐξήσσει. Thdr. l. i. c. 2. p. 7.

^q Vid. Tillem. Les Ariens Art. 2. sub in.

^r Καὶ συνόδῳ πολλῶν ἐπισκόπων καθιέρωτος τοῦ μὲν ἀρεῖου, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀποδοχομένων τῇ δοξῇ αὐτοῦ καθαιρεῖ. Socr. l. i. c.

6. p. 9. D.

^s ——— πᾶσι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Χριστὸν τὴν θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ἐξήλασαν. Ap. Thdr. l. i. c. 4. p. 10. A. Vid. & p. 19. B.

^t ——— ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ τὴν καὶ τῆς συμπροτοίας αὐτοῦ περὶ δογματικῆς. Soz. l. i. c. 15. p. 427. A.

^u Les Ariens. Art. 3. & note i.

^v Vid. Pagi Ann. 315. n. vi. vii. viii. Bagnage. 321. n. ix.

^w Ap. Socr. l. i. c. 6. p. 11. C.

Alexander

Alexander and Arius, which was not written before the year 324. So ^a Pagi, and others.

Whenever these things were done; Arius, in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, complains heavily of the hard treatment given him by his bishop. He says, he ^a was unjustly persecuted by Alexander for the truth's sake: and that he ^b and his brethren were expelled the city, as impious, for not assenting to the doctrine taught by him. Epiphanius too, expressly says, that ^c Arius and they who adhered to him, were expelled both the church and the city.

Arius being expelled from Alexandria, went ^d into Palestine, to strengthen his interest. Indeed, there were many who favoured him and his cause. Epiphanius says, it was reported, that ^e he drew over to his party seven hundred virgins consecrated to God, seven presbyters, twelve deacons, and some bishops. This great increase, or a large part of it, Epiphanius plainly supposes to have been made before Arius was excommunicated. For he says, that Alexander having summoned his presbyters, and some bishops, and strictly examining the matter, when Arius refused to own the truth, he was expelled the church and city: and ^f with him were excommunicated the virgins and the clergy above-mentioned, and a great number of people. Alexander, in his letter to his namesake of Byzantium, which we have in Theodoret, speaks, as if there ^g were many women at Alexandria who sided with Arius: and their zeal is represented by him as very great; though afterwards, to diminish their credit, as it seems, he speaks of the women that had been deceived, as ^h few, or inconsiderable. He owns likewise, that Arius and his friends boasted of having ⁱ bishops on their side. Alexander complains also of ^k three bishops of Syria, who countenanced them: meaning Eusebius of Cæsarea, Theodotus of Laodicea, and Paulinus of Tyre. And at the end of that letter, he mentions by name ^l ten presbyters and deacons at Alexandria, who had been anathematized by him as heretics.

^a A. 315. n. viii. Conf. Valef. Annot. ad Thdr. l. i. c. 4. & Bafnag. Ann. 324. n. xx.

^b ο διωκομενος υπο Αλεξανδρου παπα αδικως δια — αληθειαν. ap. Epiph. H. 69. n. 6. in.

^c — και παν κακον κινει καθ' ημων — ωσε εκδιωξαι ημας εκ της πολεις ως ανθρωπος αθης. ib. p. 731. B.

^d — εξιοι αυλοι της εκκλησιας, και εκκλησιον ποιει εν τη πολει. H. 69. n. iii. p. 729. D.

^e Epiph. ib. n. iv. in.

^f H. 69. n. iii. in.

^g — συν αυτω δε απισπασθησαν αι

προειρημεναι παρβενυσσαι, και κληρικοι οι προειρημενοι, και οκλος αλλος πολυς. ib. ad fin.

^h — δι' ενδυχιας γυναικων ατακτων α ηπαησαν. — εκ τε περι τροχαζων πασαν αυταιν αστηνως τας παρ αυλοις νυπιας. ap. Thdr. p. 9. D.

ⁱ — ηπαημενα ολιγα γυναικαρια. ib. p. 19. C.

^j — ως αν συμπληρωσιν αυλοις και ομοφροτας εχουσις επισκοπους. ib. p. 10. B.

^k ib. p. 15. C.

^l ib. p. 20.

In the letter to the bishops of the catholic church, preserved in ^m Socrates, Alexander complains of Eusebius of Nicomedia, for patronizing Arius. And moreover mentions twelve presbyters and deacons at Alexandria, and two bishops of that country, who were of that party. Their names are Arius, Achillas, Aithales, Carponas, another Arius, Sarmates, Euzoius, Lucius, Julian, Menas, Helladius, Gaius: the bishops are Secundus and Theonas.

Arius, in his letter to ⁿ Eusebius of Nicomedia, mentions Eusebius of Cæsarea, Theodotus, Paulinus, Athanasius, Gregory and Aëtius by name: and refers in general to other bishops of the east, who had been anathematized by Alexander, for teaching the same doctrine that he did. And intimates, that none of the bishops of the east had escaped that censure, except Philogonius, Hellanicus and Macarius. The places where all these were bishops, are afterwards particularly shewn by Theodoret.

Socrates observes, that ^{*} the evil, which began at Alexandria, soon spread itself all over Egypt and Libya, and the upper Thebais, and at length into other cities and countries.

Arius was at Nice when the council met there: his opinions having been condemned, he ^p was banished by Constantine. By an edict of the same emperor he and his adherents were stigmatized with the opprobrious name of Porphyrians, his books were ordered to be burned, and whoever concealed any of them were to be put to death.

Arius was afterwards recalled; and, as ^q Sozomen says, in a short time: but was not allowed to go to Alexandria; where indeed he never settled after the council of Nice, though ^r he attempted it. Tillemont says, that ^s Arius was not recalled before the year 330. Other learned men think, he ^t returned from his banishment in 327. It is certain, that Arius and Euzoius did ^u some time present a confession of faith to Constantine, with which the emperor was satisfied. He was received to the communion of the church ^x by the council of Jerusalem in ^y 335. A like attempt was ^z afterwards made at Constantino-

^m Vid. Socr. l. i. c. 6. p. 10.

ⁿ ap. Thdret. l. i. c. v. p. 21. A.

^o l. i. c. 6. in.

^p Vid. Socr. l. i.

^q 9. p. 32. Sozom. l. i. c. 21. p. 435, 436.

^r Soz. l. ii. c. 16. Conf. Socr. l. i. c. 14.

^s 44. C.

^t Vid. Socr. l. i. c. 27.

^u 37. Soz. l. ii. c. 29.

^v Les

Arens. Art. xiii. & Note ix.

^w Vid.

^x 21. Ann. 327. n. iii. iv. Bafnag. 327.

iii. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 308.

^y Socr. l. i. p. 25, 26. Soz. l. ii. c. 27.

^z Ath. Contr. Arian. p. 199, 200. De

Synod. p. 734. Soz. l. ii. c. 27. p. 486.

^{aa} Tillem. Les Ariens. Art. xxi. Pagi

A. 390. n. xiii. xvi.

^{bb} Pagi 340.

^{cc} n. xv. Bafnag. Ann. 336. n. iv. Tillem.

Les Ariens. Art. xxiv, xxv.

ple, but in vain. It is generally said, that ^a he died in a sudden and remarkable manner at Constantinople in the year 336.

II. It does not appear, that Arius's works were voluminous; though it is probable, that he wrote a good number of letters. We still have an epistle written by him ^b to Eusebius of Nicomedia, and another to ^c Alexander, bishop of Alexandria; and the ^d Confession of Faith, presented by him and Euzoius to Constantine. He also wrote ^e divers little poems, fitted for the use of common people, for promoting his peculiar opinions. A book called *Thalia*, whether in verse or prose is not absolutely ^f certain; for there are some fragments of it in Athanasius, which do not appear to be in verse. This book is mentioned by several authors, particularly ^g Socrates and ^h Sozomen; who censure the style of it, as soft and effeminate. But Sozomen honestly owns, that he speaks upon hear-say only, and that he had not seen the book. However, they both say, it was condemned by the council of Nice. As Athanasius quotes it several times, he must be supposed to have read it. He speaks of ⁱ the softness and pleasantry, or buffoonry, with which it was written: and perhaps both the fore-mentioned writers, and others likewise, took this character of the book from him. And, possibly, some said as much of Augustine's Psalm or Song upon the Donatists. Beside all these, Tillemont imagines, that ^k Arius also published some work against the heathens in defence of the Christian religion.

III. Arius was ^l very tall, grave and serious, yet affable and courteous. With good natural parts, and no inconsiderable share of secular learning of all sorts, he was ^m particularly distinguished by his skill in logic, or the art of disputing. He ⁿ had at least the outward appearance of piety. In short, he is represented as a man exceedingly well qualified to form a party, and carry on any enterprize he should engage in. So far as I recollect, his conduct was unblameable; excepting

^a Vid. Athanas. Ep. ad Serap. de Mort. Arii. p. 340, 341. Socr. l. ii. c. 38. Soz.

l. ii. c. 29. Thdr. H. E. l. i. c. 14. H. F.

l. iv. cap. 1. p. 234. Epiph. H. 69. n. v.

Ruf. H. E. l. i. c. 13. ^b Ap. Epiph.

H. 69. n. vi. Thdr. l. i. c. v. ^c ap.

eund. ib. c. vii. viii. ^d ap. Socr.

l. i. c. 26. Soz. l. ii. c. 27. p. 485.

^e Philost. H. E. l. ii. c. 2. ^f Vid.

Cav. H. L. in Ario. sub fin. ^g Socr.

l. i. c. ix. p. 30. A ^h Soz. l. i. c.

xxi. p. 435. C. D. ⁱ Εἰς τὴν θείαν

δοξάν ἐκτεθειμένους καὶ γελοίους ὄντας. De

Sent. Dionys. n. 6. p. 247.

^k Outre sa Thalie & ses autres écrits contre l'Eglise, il semble, qu'il ait fait quelque ouvrage contre les payens. — Tillem. les Ariens. Art. xxv. m.

^l Ηὗ δὲ τῆς ἡλικίας υπερμῆκης, καὶ ὅπως τὸ εἶδος — γλυκὺς ἦν τῇ προσηγορίᾳ. Epiph. H. 69. n. iii. in.

^m Διαλεκτικώτατος δὲ γινόμενος. κ. λ. Soz. l. i. c. 15. p. 426. B. Conf. Socr. l.

i. c. v. ⁿ Vir specie & forma magis

quam virtute religiosus. Rufin. H. E. l. i.

c. 1.

what relates to his zeal for maintaining his supposed errors; and that he is charged^o with dissembling his real sentiments, upon some occasions, in those difficult circumstances, to which he was reduced by the prevailing power of his adversaries.

I may add here, that he writes with much spirit, and a full assurance of the truth of his opinions; particularly in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, whom he styles^p ORTHODOX: and he tells that bishop, that^q he and his friends were unjustly persecuted by Alexander for the truth's sake, which conquers all things: that all the bishops of the east in general had been anathematized by Alexander, except Philogonius, Hellanicus, and Macarius, whom he calls^r ignorant heretics. As for himself, he was not able to endure their impious^s doctrine; nor would he ever receive it, though he were to suffer a thousand deaths from those heretics.

IV. Socrates gives this account of the rise and occasion of the Arian controversy. 'Alexander,' he^t says, 'discouraging^u one day too curiously concerning the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, in the presence of his presbyters and the rest of his clergy; Arius, one of the presbyters, supposed his bishop to advance the doctrine of Sabellius, and disliking that, he^v went into an opinion diametrically opposite.' Theodoret too says, that^w Arius took occasion from things said by Alexander to raise a disturbance. And Constantine likewise, in his letter to Alexander and Arius, first blames the former^x for putting questions to his presbyters, which he ought not; and then the latter, for inconsiderately uttering notions, that ought to have been buried in silence.

Sozomen gives this account: that^y Arius had for some time published the doctrines ascribed to him, Alexander taking little notice of the matter: but some blaming him for tolerating such novelties, moved by those complaints, and desiring to act equitably, he appointed a time for hearing the point fairly debated by Arius, and those who opposed him. At which time Arius stood to the things he had advanced: and they who opposed him, asserted the Son to be consubstantial and coeternal to the Father. And though another assembly was appointed for debating the point, they could by no means come to an

^o Αρειος γὰρ, ὡς προτέρων εἶπεν, ἑτέρα καὶ διὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν, ἑτέρα δὲ φωνὴν ὁμολογήσεν. Soz. l. ii. c. 35. in. ^p Ὁρθόδοξον.

^q Epiph. 69. n. vi. p. 731. B. ^r ib. ^s ἀσεβήτων ἀκατήχητων. ib. D.

^t ὡς τὴν αἰτίαν ἐκεῖ ἀκούσαι δυναμένη, καὶ μετὰ ταύτας ἐμὴν ἐπαποδείξωσι οἱ αἱρε-

τικοί. ib. D.

^u — φιλομαχίαν περὶ τῆς αἰτίας τριάδος, ἐν τριάδι μονάδα εἶναι, φιλόσοφων. Soz. l. i. c. v.

^v Theod. H. F. l. iv. c. i. in.

^w Ap. Euseb. De V. C. l. ii. c. 69. &

Soz. l. i. c. 7. p. 15. C. D.

^y Soz. l. i. c. xv.

agreement.

agreement. The point still remained doubtful and undecided, and ² Alexander himself was at first in some suspense; but at length he declared himself in favour of those who asserted the Son to be consubstantial and coeternal to the Father.

If we could rely upon this account, it might afford a great deal of reason to think, that the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Son's Deity, was not fully defined and determined among Christians before the council of Nice; and that there were no small numbers of persons, who held much the same doctrine with Arius. Moreover Arius, in his letter to Alexander, tells him, that ³ his faith was the same he had received from himself, and had often heard him preach. And though there is some difference between them, it seems to me, that the first three accounts, above represented, do confirm this supposition, as well as Sozomen's.

V. In the next place I would observe the opinions of Arius and his followers.

Alexander, in his letter to the bishops of the catholic church, represents their opinion in this manner: 'That ⁴ they said, ' God was not always Father. But there was a time when ' God was not Father: that the word of God was not always, ' and was made out of nothing: God who was, made him ' who was not, out of nothing. Therefore there was a time, ' when he was not. For the Son is a creature and made; nor ' is he like the Father in essence.'

But we may take Arius's opinion from himself. And I think it will appear, that in what is above transcribed from Alexander he is not misrepresented. For in his letter to Eusebius of Nocomedia he says: ' We ' cannot assent to those expres- ' sions, always Father, always Son, at the same time Father ' and Son: that the Son always co-exists with the Father; ' that the Father has no pre-existence before the Son, not so ' much as in thought, or a moment. But this we think, and ' teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor a part of the un- ' begotten by any means. Nor is he made out of any pre-

² Αμφότερα δὲ τῆς ζήτησεως εἰς δοκίμης εἶναι, πεποιθεῖν τι καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρος τὰ πρῶτα, πῶς μὲν τέλει, πῶς μὲν ἐκείνης ἐπαινῶν τελευτῶν δὲ τοῖς ὁμοῖοις καὶ συναιδίοις εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν ἀποφαινομένοις εἶδω. ib. p. 427. A.

³ — ἢ καὶ ἀπο σὺ μεμαθήκαμεν. ap. Epiph. p. 732. C. — ὡς καὶ σὺ αὐτός — ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ συνεδρίῳ — πλεονακίᾳ τῆς ταύτης ἐσηγήσαμεν ἀπηγορεύσας. ib. p. 733. A. — ὡς πᾶρα σὺ μεμαθήκαμεν — μέσῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κηρύξατο. ib. C.

⁴ Οὐκ αὖτις ὁ Θεὸς Πατὴρ ἦν. — ἢ αὖτις ὁ τῷ Θεῷ Λόγος, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἑκ οὐκ οὐκ ἦν υἱὸς; ὁ γὰρ ὢν Θεὸς τὸν μὴ οὐκ ἐκ τῷ μὴ οὐκ εἶποι. κ. λ. ap. Socr. p. 10. D.

⁵ — ἐπειδὴ ἡ συμφωνημένη αὐτῷ δὲ μοσιᾷ λεγούσῃ, αὖτις Θεός, αὖτις Υἱός, ἀμα Πατὴρ, ἀμα Υἱός — εἰ ἐπιτοια, εἰ ἀλογίᾳ τῇ προαίτι ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Υἱῷ — διακομιδῇ δὲ εἰ εἰπομεν, ἀρχὴν ἔχει ὁ Υἱός, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἀναρχὸς ἐστίν — καὶ εἰ εἰπομεν, ἐξ ἑκ οὐκ ὦν ἐστίν. κ. λ. ap. Epiph. H. 69. n. vi.

⁶ existent

‘existent thing: but by the will and pleasure of the Father he
 ‘existed before time and ages, the only begotten God, un-
 ‘changeable: and that before he was begotten, or made, or
 ‘designed, or founded, he was not.—But we are persecuted,
 ‘because we say, that the Son has a beginning, and that God
 ‘has no beginning. For this we are persecuted, and because
 ‘we say, the Son is out of nothing. Which we therefore say,
 ‘because he is not a part of God, nor made out of any pre-
 ‘existent thing.’

In his letter to Alexander himself, beside many other things,
 he says, ‘We^d believe, that there are three persons, the Fa-
 ‘ther, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. God, the cause of all
 ‘things, is alone without beginning. The^e Son, begotten of
 ‘the Father before time, made before the ages, and founded,
 ‘was not before he was begotten. Nor is he eternal, or co-
 ‘eternal, or begotten at the same time with the Father.’

So far from Alexander, and Arius himself. It may be pro-
 per to take somewhat also out of other authors.

Epiphanius’s Synopsis is to this purpose: ‘The^f Arians say,
 ‘that the Son is a creature of God, and the Holy Ghost the
 ‘creature of a creature: and that our Saviour took flesh of
 ‘Mary, but not a soul.’

In his large work he says, they^g argued, that the Spirit was
 made by the Son, because the scripture says, *All things were
 made by him, and without him nothing was made.* See John i. 3.

Of their denying our Saviour to have a soul, that is, an
 human soul, he speaks^h several times, and argues against itⁱ
 largely. Athanasius too, expressly says, that^k the Arians
 maintained, that Christ had flesh only, as a covering for his
 Deity: and that the Word in him was the same as the soul in
 us. He supposeth them likewise to allow, that the Word, or
 Deity in Christ, was liable to suffering in the body. Theo-
 doret^l ascribes to them the same opinion. He again ascribes
 it to^m Arius and Eunomius. Augustine too, takes notice of

^d Ap. Epiph. ib. n. viii. in.

^e Ο δε Υιος αχρονως γεννηθεις υπο τε πα-
 τρος—ουκ ην προ τε γεννηθηναι. ibid.

^f T. i. p. 606.

^g H. 69. n. 18.

p. 741. D. Vid. & n. 56.

^h Αλλα
 και αρισιαι ψυχην αυτον ανθρωπινην ειλη-
 φηται. H. 69. n. 19 p. 743. A. Conf.
 n. 48—51.

ⁱ Vid. ib. n. 16. & 17.

^k Αριος δε σαρκα μονην προς αποκρυψη
 της Θεοτητας ομολοει· αυτη δε τε σωθεν εν
 τω ανθρωπω, τελει της ψυχης, τον λογον

εν τη σαρκι λησει γινωσκαι· την τε παθης
 νοσην, και την εξ αδη αναγασιν τη θεοτητι
 προστασειν τολμων. Contr. Apollin. l. ii.
 n. 3. p. 942. C.

^l Και μελλοι και τον
 της εν ανθρωπησειωσ ηκρωτηριασε λογον· σωμα
 γαρ αυτον αφυχον εφη ειληφεναι, εηρησκευται
 δε τα της ψυχης την Θεοτητα. H. F. l. iv.
 c. 1. p. 232. D.

^m Αριος δε και ευ-
 νομιος σωμα μεν αυτον εφασαν ειληφεναι,
 την Θεοτητα δε της ψυχης εηρησκευται την
 χριτας. Ib. l. v. c. 11. p. 278. D.

this opinion in his account ^a of this sect, and in other arguments ^a against them.

An anonymous Arian in Augustine says: The ^p Father is greater than the Son, the Son incomparably greater and better than the Spirit. And ^a the Father begot the Son by his will: the Son by his own power alone made the Spirit.

Maximin, in Augustine, says, the ^r Son is not only God, but a great God: which he argues from Tit. ii. 13. Again, We ^r worship the Father and the Son: but shew a text, where we are commanded to worship the Spirit.

VI. There were in the fourth century several divisions in this sect. Epiphanius^r, and Augustine^a after him, have four distinct articles in speaking of them: Arians or Ariomanites, Semiarrians, Macedonians or Pneumatomachi, Aëtians, called also Eunomians and Anomeans.

They were very remarkable for the numerous councils held by them, and for their numerous creeds, especially in the time of Constantius. Socrates computes their creeds ^a or confessions to have been nine in number; and calls them a labyrinth. Some moderns, not attending to the design of Socrates, have multiplied them greatly. He speaks of public creeds, agreed in councils of bishops: they add to them several confessions made by particular persons upon divers occasions. Insomuch, that Fluery^r makes out a catalogue of sixteen; and Tillemont, not content to stop there, computes ^a eighteen. Athanasius using a round number, says they had had at ^a least ten synods. Learned moderns do sometimes reckon eleven ^b public creeds, the last of which was drawn up in the year ^a 361.

^a In eo autem quod Christum sine anima solam carnem suscepisse arbitrantur, minus noti sunt: nec adversus eos ab aliquo inveni de hac re aliquando fuisse certatum. Sed hoc verum esse, & Epiphanius non tacuit, & ego ex eorum quibusdam scriptis & collocationibus certissime inveni. De Hær. c. 49.

^a Ecce in quibus verbis suis omnino manifestant negare se, quod ad unitatem personæ Christi etiam humana anima pertineat: sed in Christo carnem & divinitatem tantummodo confiteri. Contr. Sermon. Arian. n. 7. T. 8.

^p Pater major est Filio: Filius incomparabiliter major & melior est Spiritu. Sermon. Arian. n. 24. ap. Aug. T. 8.

^a Pater immobiliter & impassibiliter volens Filium genuit: Filius sine labore & fatione sola virtute sua Spiritum

fecit. Ib. n. 26.

^r Est autem Filius secundum apostolum non pusillus, sed magnus Deus. Sicut ait beatus apostolus: Expectando beatam spem, & adventum gloriæ magni Dei & Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi. Collat. cum Maxim. n. 13. ap. Aug. T. 8.

^a Ib. n. 14. Vid. n. 11.

^r H. 69. 73. 74. 76.

^a De Hær. c. 49. 51. 52. 54.

^r Ημεις δε τω λαβουρισθω των εκθιστων οψι πολε διανοουτες, την απαρημνησιν αυτων συναλασσωμεν. Socr. l. i. c. 41. p. 154. D.

^r Fluery B. 14. ch. 33. Vol. 2. p. 294.

^a Les Ariens Art. 102.

^a Ηδη γαρ τοις δεκα και πλεον περ συνοδους πεποιηκασι. Ad Afros. n. 2. p. 892. B.

^b Vid. Petav. ad Epiph. H. 73. n. xxvii. p. 327.

^a Vid. Benedictin. Monit. ad Athan. de Synod. p. 715.

The Arians seem to have pleased themselves with ^c the great number of their synods. But others were of a different opinion: and the confessions of faith published by them were not unanimous. Athanasius ^d often banters them for their numerous creeds, and for making new creeds almost every year; thus shewing themselves dissatisfied with their own performances, and rescinding what had been before established by them. He says, it was matter of great grief to himself, and many others, that the whole world was disturbed by them. Nor could they without pain see those ^e who were called clergymen, continually running from one place to another, to learn how they ought to believe in Jesus Christ. It was, moreover, a cause of scandal to catechumens, and of much laughter to the heathen.

These numerous synods, this frequent creed-making, occasioned that remark of Ammianus Marcellinus, a heathen author; that ^f Constantius corrupted the simplicity of the Christian religion; and that the bishops of his reign, continually galloping to councils, jaded all the post-horses, and wore out all the public carriages of the empire. The same complaint is found in some ^g of the ecclesiastical writers.

VII. In their creeds they are generally very free in anathematizing such as differed from them. In their council at Antioch in 341, under the direction of Eusebius of Nicomedia, and his friends, they say: 'We ^h anathematize all heretical pravity. And if any one contrary to the sacred doctrine of the scriptures say, that the Son is a creature as one of the creatures—or if any one shall teach or preach any thing beside what we have received, let him be anathema.' And in a like manner, more at large in their long creed at Antioch,

^c — παρακαλυμμεν μη ανηχισθαι, καθα προσηγοριαν, των προβαλλομενων οχλον συνιδων προφασει πιστεως — κ. λ. Ad. Afros. n. 10. p. 899. C.

^d Παιδα γινε κινησι και ταραττεισι, και οδω ειν τοις ιαυτων αρχηναι· και ενιαυτοι γαρ, ως οι τας διαθηκας γραφομεν, συνερχομενοι και αλλοι προσποιεσθαι περι πιστεως γραφειν· οα και εν τω γλωσσω μαλλιν και αισχυνην εφελκυσιν, δι μη παρ ελκων αλλα παρ αυτων τα αυτων εκβαλλειν. Ad. Ep. Aeg. & Lib. n. 6. in. p. 275.

^e — ως την οικουμενην διαταραχθηναι, και της λεβομενης εν τω καιρω τω κληρικης διαταραχην αυη και κατω, και ζηλει, πως αρα μαθωσι πιστευειν εις τον κερυ ημων Ιησουν Χριστον — τω δε τοις μη κληρικημοις εκ ελκων σκανδαλον τοις ει ελκωσι, η το τυχοι, αλλα και πωλων γλωσσω παρισχει. De Spnod. n. 9. p. 717.

^f Christianam religionem absolutam & simplicem anili superstitione confundens: in qua scrutanda perplexius, quam componenda gravius excitavit discidia plurima, quæ progressa fufius aluit concertatione verborum: ut catervis antistitum jumentis publicis ultro citroque discurrentibus per synodos quas appellant, dum ritum omnem ad suum trahere conantur arbitrium, rei vehiculariæ succederet nervos. Ammian. l. xxi. c. ult.

^g Cursusque ipse publicus attritus ad nihilum deducitur. Hilar. p. 1320. c.

^h — πασαι αιρεσεις ανανθεματιζομεν· και οτις — διδασκει, λεγων, αναθημα εγω· και ει τοις λεγει τον υιον κτισμα ως εν των κτισματων — η ει τις αλλο διδασκει η εναντιολιζειν παρ ο παριλαμβομεν, αναθημα εγω. Ap. Socr. l. ii. c. x. p. 88. B.

in 345, which may be seen in ¹ Athanasius, and ^k Socrates. Their creed at Sirmium, against Photinus, in 351, concludes with ^l seven and twenty anathemas, three of which are these: 'If ^m any one say, that Abraham did not see the Son, but the unbegotten God, or a part of him, let him be anathema. ' If any one say, it was not the Son, who wrestled with Jacob, but the unbegotten God, or a part of him, let him be anathema. If any one understand those words in Gen. xix. 24. *the Lord rained fire from the Lord*, not of the Father and Son, but that God rained from himself, let him be anathema. For *the Lord the Son rained from the Lord the Father.*'

Indeed I think, that this sect shewed little moderation in the fourth century. Whenever ⁿ they had the emperor on their side, they failed not to make use of his authority. Between the emperors Valentinian and Valens, two brothers, the former the elder, emperor in the West, and favourer of the Nicene doctrine, the latter emperor in the East, Socrates observes this difference; Valentinian ^o encouraged the men of his own principles, without being at all troublesome to the Arians: but Valens, desirous to promote Arianism, grievously intreated those who were not of that opinion, as the sequel of our history will shew.

So Socrates, who is the more to be regarded, because he shews a great deal of impartiality, and censures the bishops of his own principles, when they assumed a lordly power and authority: of which some instances were given ^p formerly. Another is this. 'Theodosius, bishop of Synada in Phrygia Patcatiana,' he says, 'cruelly ^q persecuted the heretics in that city: of which there were many, of the Macedonian sect. He not only expelled them the city, but the country: in which he did not act agreeably to the custom of the orthodox church. Nor was he influenced by a zeal for the right faith, but by love of money, which he endeavoured to extort from the heretics.'

ⁱ De Synod. n. 26. p. 738. &c.

^k L. ii. c. 19.

^l Ap. Athan. de Synod. n. 27. p. 742, 743.

^m Vid.

ib. p. 743. Anathem. xv. xvi. xvii.

ⁿ — υποσχισι τι αμα και φοβηρισμοις, ος τοις βασιλικοις προσαγμασι, και τη βασιλειω, ουαλειος θυμω αναλησθε, τοις μη βελομενοις κατα την αυτων πιστιν φερεσθαι. Epiph. H. 69. n. 34. p. 757. B.

^o Ουαλεντινιαιος μεν γαρ της μεν οικειης συντηρει τοις δε αρηταις ουαμως ην

οχληρος ουαλης δε αειωνος αυτησαι πη αιρεμενος, δεινα κατα των μη τοιαυτα φρονητων επιρασας. — Socr. l. iv. c. 1. p. 211. B.

^p See Vol iii. p. 232.

^q Ος της εν αυτη αιρετικης, πολλοι δε η αυτη οικης επιλχανον της μακεδονικης θρησκείας, συντονως εδιωκεν. εξελαντων αυτες μη μονον της πολεις, αλλα δε και των αλφει. Και τελο εποικη, ηκ ευαθως διωκει τη οριε δεξ: εκκλησια. L. vii. c. 3. in.

I know not how to forbear observing Acacius's bitter manner of writing controversy; who tells Marcellus, that ' he deserved to have his tongue cut out.

If any desire to see some other instances of their partiality, and violent zeal, they may consult the authors referred to at the bottom of the * page.

VIII. Arius and his followers received the same books of the sacred scripture, that other Christians did, and shewed the like respect for them.

1. It is needless to allege particular proofs of their receiving the several books of the New Testament. It is apparent from the remains of Arius himself, and from the Arian writers, and their councils, and the arguments of catholic writers against them, that they received the four gospels, the Acts, and all other books generally received by other Christians.

2. There is indeed one exception: for Theodoret, in his preface to his Commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, says, that ' they did not receive that epistle. And Epiphanius speaks ' to the like effect.

With regard to this, we may say, that if it be true, it needs not to be reckoned a very great fault: forasmuch as there were about the same time some catholics, who either quite rejected this epistle, or doubted of its genuineness and authority. But secondly, I apprehend, it was generally received by them, and that it could not be rejected by many of them. What Epiphanius says, is very pleasant: ' Let * us now,' says he, ' observe some other texts, which they perverting allege in ' favour of their sentiments. And here they in vain allege ' that text, *Consider ' the Apostle and High-priest of your profession, who was faithful to him that made him.* For first of all, ' they reject the epistle to the Hebrews, saying, that it is not ' the apostle's, though they allege that text, in order to per- ' vert it.' Now, if they quoted that epistle, I think, they could not reject it. And in another place Epiphanius expresseth himself in this manner: ' And ^z beside this, they allege

* — ἐκλεμψθαι τὴν αἰοσίαν ὠφέλις γράσαν. Ap. Epiph. H. 72. n. viii. in.

^z Vid. Ath. Hist. Arian. n. 1, 2. p. 345. & n. 32, &c. p. 631, &c. Tillem. Les Ariens art. 95.

¹ Θαυμαστον εἶδεν διὰ τὴν αἰρετικὴν εισδιδάσκοντες νοσον καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν λυτῶν γραμμάτων, καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπεκρίνουσιν, καὶ νοθὸν ταύτην ἀποκαλοῦσιν. Theod. opp. T. iii. p. 393. A.

² Vid. H. 69. n. 37.

^x Καὶ γὰρ παλιν ἡδαιῶς φασὶ τὸ τοῦ ἔθλου παρερμενεύοντες τὸ διδάσκει τὸν ἀρχιερεῖα ὑμῶν πρὸς οὐκὰ τὰ ποιήσαντι αὐτοῦ. Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ταύτην, τὴν πρὸς ἑβραίους φημι, ἀπαθεῖναι, φασὶ αὐτὴν ἀναιρέτως ἀπὸ τῆς ἀποστολῆς, καὶ λησθῆναι μὴ εἶναι τὴν αὐτῆς. H. 69. n. 37. in.

^y Heb. iii. 1, 2.

^z Ἀλλὰ λοιπὸν ὅσα ἐστὶ τείλοισι ὁμοία, τὸ ἐν τῇ ἀποστολῇ γεγραμμένον, τὸ διδάσκει, κ. λ. H. 69. n. xiv.

‘ the saying of the apostle, *Consider the High-priest of your profession, who was faithful to him that made him*: and what is written in the Gospel of John, *He^a that cometh after me was before me*: and that which is written in the Acts of the Apostles, *Therefore^b let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.*’ Since then they quoted the Epistle to the Hebrews together with other books of unquestioned authority, it could not be rejected by them^{bb}.

Maximin, the Arian bishop, quotes the epistle to the Hebrews, as ‘ Paul’s. Eunomius^d likewise seems to refer to it.

3. Having said what is needful relating to this point, I shall allege some evidences of their respect for the sacred scriptures.

In his letter to Alexander, Arius professes to believe in one God, the ‘ God of the law, and the prophets, and the New Testament.

A creed of theirs begins in this manner: ‘ We^e believe agreeably to the evangelical and apostolical tradition, or doctrine.’ Afterwards, in the same creed, ‘ We^e sincerely believe and maintain all things taught in the divine scriptures, both by prophets and apostles.’ Again, ‘ We^h declare the ancient faith, which the prophets, and gospels, and apostles have preached by the authority of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.’

Moreover, the Arians all along argued against the use of the words consubstantial and essence, and like phrases, because theyⁱ were not in scripture. Athanasius often takes notice of this. But he says, that^k though they blamed the council of Nice for using unscriptural words, they did the same themselves. So likewise^l Epiphanius.

^a John i. 30.

^b Acts ii. 36.

^{bb} Comp. Leontius Byz. de Sectis. Aët. 3. p. 505. Bibb. P. P. T. xi. Paris 1644. Where he supposes them to receive the Acts and the Ep. to the Hebrews, and to argue as they are represented by Epiphanius.

^c Sic ad Hebræos ipse scribens ait: Purificatione peccatorum facta, confedit ad dexteram magnitudinis in excelsis. Vid. Collat. cum Maximin. n. 14. (3). Conf. Heb. i. 3.

^d Τον ἐπὶ τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἠσπασα τοῖς παλαίσις. Eunom. Exp. Fid. ap. Tabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 257.

^e ——— νομὴ καὶ ἀποφῆλων, καὶ καὶ τῆς διαθήκης τῶν Θεῶν—κ. λ. Ap. Epiph. H. 69. n. vii.

^f Πιστεύομεν ἀκολουθῶς τῇ εὐαγγελικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ παραδόσει.

Ap. Socr. l. ii. c. x. p. 87. B.

Ἐ ἡμεῖς γὰρ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ τῶν Θεῶν γραφῶν παραδιδόμενοι, ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων, ἀληθινῶς τε καὶ ἐμφανῶς, καὶ πιστεύομεν καὶ ἀκολουθοῦμεν. ib. p. 88. C.

^h ——— ἢ καὶ οἱ προφῆται, καὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι διὰ τῆς κυρίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκνήσαν. Ap. Ath. de Synod. p. 723. B.

ⁱ Τέλει χάρις, τὸ μὴ ομοῖοσιον, καὶ τὸ ομοῖοσιον ἐκαλλέμεν, ὡς ἀλλότριον γραφῶν. Ap. Ath. de Synod. n. 29. p. 746. B. Vid. ib. n. 30. p. 747. C. D.

^k Vid. Or. i. contr. Arian. n. 30. p. 434. D. De Decret. Nic. Synod. n. 18. p. 223, 224. De Synodis. n. 36. p. 751. A. Ad Afr. Ep. n. 6. p. 896. A.

^l Vid. Epiph. H. 73. n. i. p. 845. C.

Maximin opens the conference with Augustine in this manner. 'If ^a you say what is reasonable, I must submit. If ^b you allege any thing from the divine scriptures, which are common to both, I must hear: but unscriptural expressions deserve no regard.' And as he professeth to receive the creed drawn up at Ariminum, so he ^c affirms it to be agreeable to scripture. And he concludes with saying, that ^d it is his wish and aim, to think in all things as the divine scriptures teach.

IX. I shall now give a short account of several Arian authors,

1. Says Jerom, 'Acacius', called Monophthalmus because he was blind on one eye, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, wrote seventeen volumes upon Ecclesiastes, and six volumes of Miscellaneous Questions, and many other treatises. So great was his authority under Constantius, that he got Felix an Arian, to be made bishop of Rome in the stead of Liberius.'

Acacius succeeded the famous Eusebius in 340, and died about the year 366. Socrates speaking of Eusebius's death, and Acacius's succeeding him, says, that ^e he was Eusebius's scholar, and wrote many books, particularly the life of his master: which last, to our great grief, is lost, as well as the rest. And it is somewhat strange, that Jerom should omit Acacius's life of his predecessor.

In Epiphanius ^f is a long quotation from a book of Acacius against Marcellus. In one of his letters Jerom quotes ^g a long passage of the fourth book of this writer's Select Questions. It contains an explication of 1 Cor. xv. 21. Afterwards in the same letter, he mentions Acacius ^h with other commentators, whom he made use of, though for learning they fell much short of Origen and Eusebius.

^a Si aliquid rationale dixeris, necesse est, ut sequar. Si quid enim de divinis scripturis protuleris, quod commune est cum omnibus, necesse est, ut audiamus. Ex vero voces, quæ extra scripturam sunt, nullo casu a nobis suscipiuntur, &c. Collat. cum Maximin. n. i. ap. August. T. viii.

^b — sed ut ostendam auctoritatem patrum, qui secundum divinas scripturas fidem nobis tradiderunt illam, quam a divinis scripturis didicerunt. Ib. n. 4.

^c Oro & opto discipulus esse divinarum scripturarum. — Si affirmaveris de divinis scripturis: si alicubi scriptam lectionem protuleris, nos divinarum scripturarum optamus inveniri discipuli. Ib. sub fin.

^d Acacius, quem quia luscus erat, μονοφθαλμος nuncupabant, Cæsariensis ecclesie in Palæstina episcopus elaboravit in Ecclesiastem decem & septem volumina, &

συμμικτων ζητημάτων sex, & multos præterea diversosque tractatus. In tantum autem sub Constantio Imperatore claruit, ut in Liberii locum Romæ Felicem Arianum episcopum constitueret. De V. l. c. 98.

^e Socr. l. ii. c. 4. Conf. l. iii. c. 2. p. 499. C. ^f H. 72. n. vi—ix.

^g Acacius Cæsareæ — post Eusebium Pamphili episcopus, in quarto συλλεγμένων ζητημάτων libro. — Ep. 152. ad Minerv. & Alex. T. 4. P. i. p. 213. m.

^h Ego & in adolescentia & in extrema ætate profiteor & Originem & Eusebium Cæsariensem viros esse doctissimos, sed errasse. Quod e contrario de Theodoro, Acasio, Apollinario possumus dicere. Et tamen omnes in explanationibus scripturarum sudoris sui memoriam reliquerunt. Ib. p. 220. m.

Tillemont supposes Acacius to be the author of ^a a book against Sabellius: one of the fourteen small pieces published by Sirmond, as written by Eusebius.

Sozomen says of Acacius, that ^a he was a diligent imitator of his predecessor, by whom he had been instructed in sacred learning [or in the knowledge of the sacred scriptures]; that he was a man of good sense, and able to express himself agreeably, and that he left behind him many books worthy of notice. In another place he says, that ^y the dignity of his see, and the reputation of his master, together with his succeeding to the possession of his library, gave Acacius a great deal of authority. He moreover says, that he was very dextrous in accomplishing his designs.

Philostorgius says, that ^a Acacius was a bold disputant, very ready at discerning the merits of a cause, and able to express his thoughts to advantage. He likewise chargeth him ^a with dissimulation upon some occasions. And indeed Acacius is generally reckoned a man of unsteady principles.

I hope this may suffice for an account of Acacius, with regard to letters, and his general character. For his behaviour and management at synods, his various fortune, his differences with Cyril of Jerusalem, and others, I beg leave to refer to other ^b writers.

2. Aëtius, according to ^c Cave, began to be famous about the year 359, and died in 366, or soon after, in the reign of Valens.

Socrates has a ^d chapter, intitled Of Aëtius the Syrian, Master of Eunomius. He says, that Aëtius was born at Antioch, and studied some while at Alexandria; from whence he returned to Antioch, and was ordained deacon by Leontius, then bishop of that city. Epiphanius says, he ^e was made deacon by George the Arian bishop of Alexandria.

Aëtius's history is told at large by ^f Gregory Nyssen, and ^g Philostorgius. Gregory seems to give wrong turns to several

^a See Les Ariens art 28. & Eusebe de Cesarée art 9.

^x Ος προς αυτον ευσεβιον τον ζηλον ιχυν, και υπ αυτω της ιερης παιδειας λογις, ικανος τε ισκει και φραζειν αειος εινελο, ως και πολλα συζητηματα λοβι αξια καλελιπειν. Soz. I. iii. c. 2. p. 499. C.

^y Και επιστημη προεως ιουδαιας, και ευσεβιον τον παμφιλον — διδασκαλον αυτων, και τη δοκησει και διαδοχη των αυτω βιβλιων, πλεον των αλλων σκιον σιδειναι. Soz. I. iv. c. 23. p. 578. A. B.

^a Ηι δε ακακιος διαρρα-

λιος εν τοις αλωσι, διανοηθηναι τε παρμα-
τος φυσιν οξυν, και λοβω δηλωσαι το γνωσθι
ικανος. Phil. I. iv. c. 12. p. 497. A.

^a Ος ελεος μεν ην την δοξαν, ελεος δε τον
γλωτταν. ib. p. 498. A.

^b Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. Tillem. Hist. des Ariens. Tout-

tée Dissert. de Vit. S. Cyrill.

^c H. L. T. i. p. 218.

^e H. 76. n. i.

contr. Eunom. I. i. p. 292, &c.

^g Phil. I. iii. c. 15.

^d L. ii. c.

^f Gr. N.

things. The sum however of both accounts is to this purpose: Aëtius's father, by some mismanagement of his affairs, was reduced; and when ^h he died, Aëtius and his mother were left in great straits. For some time Aëtius worked at the goldsmith's trade for a livelihood: after his mother's death, as Philostorgius says, Aëtius applied himself to learning, and with great success, through the happiness of his genius. He ⁱ afterwards learned the art of physic, from a skilful physician at Alexandria; which he practised in a very honourable manner, giving his advice free to such as wanted it. And Cave ^k allows his happy disposition for literature. Epiphanius observes, that ^l Aëtius was ignorant of secular learning, till he came to man's estate.

Socrates, in the chapter before referred to, says of Aëtius, that ^m his chief excellence was a contentious skill: that he had small acquaintance with the scriptures, or the ancients who had written commentaries upon the Christian oracles: and that he had but little esteem for Clement, Africanus and Origen, though they were so distinguished for knowledge and learning.

So Socrates: and what he says may be true for the most part. It is likely enough, that Aëtius had not fully acquainted himself with the more ancient Christian writers: notwithstanding which he might be a man of good sense. And Philostorgius says, that ⁿ when one of his masters gave a wrong interpretation of the divine oracles, Aëtius corrected him: and that he read and studied the gospels with great care under Athanasius, a disciple of Lucian, and bishop of Anazarbus: and that he read the epistles of Paul with Antony, then presbyter of Tarsus: and afterwards the prophets, particularly Ezekiel, with Leontius, at that time presbyter of Antioch.

^h Νενό δε τον αἰλιον οὐλα εις ισχαλον συν τη μητρι πτωιας ελασαι, και δια τελο επι το χρυσουιν ορμησαι.—δια ραμην φυσιως επι τας λοφικας επιγραφηναι μαθησεις κ. λ. ib. p. 488. B.

ⁱ Αριστων δε εν ιατρικη Αἰλιος αμισθον παρειχει τοις δεομενοις τη θεραπεια. ib. p. 488. B.

^k Aurifabrum vero fuisse Aëtium, certius constat: sed mortua demum matre, homo præstanti indole ad philosophicas disciplinas animum applicuit. Cav. in Aëtio.

^l Ουλος ο Αἰλιος ο καλα τον κοσμικον λογον απαιδευτος ην, εως της τελειας αυτω ηλικιας, ως λοφος. H. 76. n. ii. in.

^m Ουτω δε ην ολιγομαθης ο Αἰλιος, και των κειν γραμματικων αμυνης το εριςικον

δε καλωρθωναι μοτον, οπερ και αλφοικος τις ποιησειεν· ως μητε της αρχαιης της τα Χριστιανικα λογια ερμηνευσαιας ασκηθηναι, πολλα χαιρειν φρασας τοις περι Κλημεντα, και Αφρικανον, και Οριγενην, ανδρας πασης σοφιας επισημοτας. Socr. l. ii. c. 35. p. 130. B. Conf. Thdr. l. ii. c. 24. & 27.

ⁿ Ο δε τυ διδασκαλη δημοσια πολε καταλας εις ειλιχον, ολι μη των θων λογων ορθην ποιησω την διηγησιν.—κειθεν δε ελαθεις, αθανασιω συγγινεται, παρ' ω της ευαγγελιστας αναλυσας, και τοις καθ' εκαστον αυτον επισησας, επι την ταρσον παρα αυτωινο αφικνεσθαι.—υφ' η τας τε αποστολη αναδιδαχθεις επιτελας.—κ. λ. ubi supr. p. 487. B. C.

And Theodoret observes, that * Eunomius greatly extolled Aëtius in his writings, and called him a man of God, and bestowed on him many commendations.

Theodoret in an account of Aëtius and Eunomius says, that Aëtius improved upon the blasphemies of Arius: for which cause Constantius banished him into a remote part of Phrygia. For after his father's death, being influenced by some of his courtiers, he made a law, that no man should say, the Son of God was of the same substance with God, nor of a different substance: for he said, it was not lawful to talk of the nature of God. But he directed men to say, that he is in all things like to him that begat him. Aëtius therefore being the first who said, the Son was altogether unlike to the Father, was banished into the fore-mentioned place.

The emperor Julian not only restored Aëtius, as he did others, who were banished in the reign of Constantius; but likewise did him the honour to write him ^a a letter, and invite him to court. He also ^t gave him an estate near Melitene in Lesbos, where Aëtius resided sometimes. Nevertheless, it is generally concluded from ^a Philostorgius's account, that Aëtius died at Constantinople. He plainly says, that ^t Aëtius was buried by Eunomius and other friends, in a very handsome manner.

The displeasure of the catholics against Aërius was so great, that, as ^u Socrates says, he had the surname of Atheist. Athanasius ^x mentions him with the same odious appellation. And Cave says, he ^y was justly so called.

Socrates says, that ^a Aëtius wrote letters to the emperor Constantius, and others, filled with a contentious sophistry.

Epiphanius has preserved ^a a small book of Aëtius, concerning the faith, consisting of seven and forty propositions, or short chapters, which he distinctly answers. And Epiphanius says, it was reported, that he ^b had drawn up three hundred such chapters.

* Theod. H. E. l. ii. c. 29. in.

P — ὁμοῦ τελεῖται ἀναφορευοῖσα μὴτε
 ἐμοσιον, μὴτε μὴ ἔπρονσιον τοῦμας τῶα
 λαίαν τῶν ἱσῶν τῶν Θεῶν· ἢ γὰρ οὐσίαν ἐλεῖται
 τῶν Θεῶν τῶν ἐσῶν κρυπταῖ· οὐκίαν δὲ καλὰ
 πᾶσι καὶ τῶν γενησῶν λαίαν ἐκείνους· Δία τοι
 τέλο καὶ τῶν Ἀσῶν φαναι· πᾶσι τῶν τελεῖται
 ἀπομοῖον ἵσαι τῶν ἱσῶν καλὰ πᾶσι τῶν
 γενησῶν Θεῶν· κ. λ. H. E. l. iv. c. 3. sub
 in. Conf. ejusd. H. E. l. ii. c. 27. p. 112.
 & Epiph. H. 76. n. iii. q Julian.
 Ep. 31. Phil. l. ix. c. 4.

r Phil. i. ix. c. 4.

* Ib. cap. 6.

* Ib. cap. 6. † Καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ
κηδῖαν μίαν τῶν ομοφρονῶν τελισάμενη πρὸς
τὸ λαμπροῦς. Ib. ὁ Διὸς καὶ ἰσχυρῆς.

λεῖτο ὁ αἰθερς. Socr. l. ii. c. 35. p. 130. D.
Vid. eund. l. iv. c. 7. p. 215. B.

^x Ο θρυλόμενος Αηλίας, ο επικληθείς πατρις.
De Synod. n. 6. p. 720. A. ^y Unde

Athei cognomen ei merito adhæsit. Cav.
ubi supr. z Ubi. supr. p. 130. B.

^a H. 76. p. 924. &c. ^b lb. p. 930. D.

p. 293.

3. Anonymous author of a Commentary ^c upon the book of Job, in three books, ascribed to Origen, but plainly not his, and written after the rise of the Arian controversy. Some have thought it to be the work of a Latin author, particularly Maximin the Arian, to be mentioned by and by. But Huet, to whom ^d I refer, has well observed, that this work in Latin, as we now have it, is a translation from the Greek. I know not the exact time of it; but, probably, it was written before the end of the fourth century. The three books of this work contain a comment only upon the first and second, and part of the third chapter of the book of Job. It is, in my opinion, a dull and tedious performance.

I shall make no extracts out of it any farther than to observe, that many books of the Old and New Testament are here quoted, particularly ^e the Acts of the Apostles; and that the author appears to have received ^f the epistle to the Hebrews.

4. Anonymous author of a Discourse ^g or Sermon, answered at length by Augustine: which confutation was written ^h about the year 418. That sermon is a short performance, in which many texts of the gospels and epistles of the apostles are quoted.

5. 'Asterius,' says ⁱ Jerom, 'a philosopher of the Arian faction, in the reign of Constantius, wrote Commentaries ^j upon the epistle to the Romans, and upon the gospels, and ^k the psalms, and many other things, which are much read by ^l the men of his party.'

In the chapter ^m of Marcellus, Jerom had before mentioned a book of Asterius against that bishop. And there must have been before that some work of Asterius, which provoked Marcellus to write: as is evident from ⁿ Eusebius, and ^o Sozomen.

All his writings are lost. Athanasius however has quoted ^p some passages: and there are some other in Eusebius's books

^c Ad calcem T. ii. Opp. Origen. ex edit. Bened. ^d Origenian. l. iii. n. 2.

^e Sicut dictum est ad Cornelium: Orationes tuæ & eleemosynæ tuæ ascenderunt sursum in memoriam coram Deo. Act. x. 4. Ascenderunt procul dubio ab angelis, atque spiritalibus ministris delatæ. De quibus dicitur: omnes sunt ministeriales spiritus pro his qui salutem in hereditatem capiunt. Hebr. i. 14. Orig. Opp. T. ii. p. 856. B. C. ^f Vid. not. c.

^g Ap. August. T. 8, ^h Sub hæc venit in manus meas quidam sermo Ariano- rum, sine nomine auctoris sui. Huic, pen- tente atque instante qui eum mihi miserat, quanta potui etiam brevitate ac celeritate respondi. Retr. l. ii. c. 32.

ⁱ Asterius, Arianæ philosophus factionis, scripsit in epistolam ad Romanos, & in Evangelia, & Psalmos, Commentarios, & multa alia, quæ a suæ partis hominibus stu- diosissime loquuntur. De V. I. c. 94.

^k Cap. 86. ^l Vid. Euseb. contr. Marcell. l. i. c. 4. & de Ecc. Theol. l. ii. c. 19. p. 132, 133. D. l. iii. c. 4. p. 863. A. B.

^m Προφασεις δι γινον μαρ- κελω ταυτης της γραφης Αστεριος τε εκ Καπ- παδοκίας σοφιστης, ος και περι τη δογματος λογος συγγραφων της Αριου δογματος συμφε- ρομενης. κ. λ. Soz. l. ii. c. 33. p. 495.

ⁿ Vid. Orat. 2. contr. Arian. n. 37. p. 505. & Or. 3. n. 2. & de Synod. n. 18. & alibi.

against

against Marcellus *. And in Eusebius's Commentary upon the fourth Psalm, published by Montfaucon, there are inserted Asterius's observations upon the same Psalm: in which several texts of the New Testament are quoted, and divers of our Saviour's miracles rehearsed; where also there appears an air of piety, and zeal for the Christian religion.

Socrates says, that ^p Asterius was a sophist of Cappadocia, and that forsaking Gentilism he embraced Christianity. He afterwards published books in favour of Arianism, which were extant in the time of that ecclesiastical historian; who farther adds, that Asterius was very much with Arian bishops, and frequented synods, desiring to be himself also bishop of some city. But having sacrificed in the time of the persecution, he never obtained that honour. This chapter of Socrates may be compared with another of ^q Sozomen. That lapse of Asterius happened, it is likely, in the year 304, or thereabout. Epiphanius expressly says, it ^r was in Maximian's persecution. Asterius is often mentioned by Athanasius; he calls ^s him a cunning sophist, and patron of heresy: and speaks ^t of his having sacrificed in the time of the last heathen persecution. Nor does Philostorgius dissemble that ^u fault; but adds, that Asterius was recovered by his master Lucian.

According to Philostorgius, Asterius was a moderate Arian; for in one place he says, that ^x Asterius taught the Son to be in substance like the Father: in another, to ^y be a complete likeness of the Father.

It is needless to give any farther account of the remaining fragments or passages of this writer. Jerom's article alone is sufficient evidence of his respect for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

6. Says Jerom, ' Basil ^z of Ancyra, skilful in the art of physic, wrote against Marcellus, and a book concerning Vir-

* Vid. supr. not. 1.

^p Αστεριος τις εν Καππαδοκία σοφιστην μελίων, την μιν καλεσάμενος Χριστιανίζειν δε επηγελλάμενος. Επιχειρεί δε και λόγους συγγραφεῖν, οί μεχρι νυν φερόμενοι, δι' ον το Αρειαν συνίστη δόγμα. κ. λ. Socr. l. i. c. 36. in. Vid. & Soz. l. ii. c. 33. & supr. not. m. ^q L. ii. c. 33.

^r H. 76. n. iii. p. 915. C.

^s Ο πανήγυρτος σοφιστης Αστεριος, ο και της αιρεσεως συνιστορας. Or. i. contr. Arian. n. 30. p. 435. B. Vid & Or. 2. n. 28.

^t Αστεριος ο δυσσας. De Decret. Nic. Synod. n. 8. in. Αστεριος δε τις απο Καππαδοκίας, πολυκεφαλός σοφιστης—επειδὴ δυσσας εν τῷ περιεργῷ διαβῶν τῷ κατὰ τον

παππον τῷ Κωνσταντίνῳ ἐκ ἡδυνάτο παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰς κληρον προαχθῆναι. De Synod. n. 18. p. 731. E.

^u Phil. l. ii. c. 14. ^x Ο δὲ [εὐδοξιος] τῆς αρειανῆς μιν διέβηκεν, πλὴν ἐκ τῷ αστερίῳ γραμματικῶν εἰς τὸ κατ' ἑστὶαν ὁμοίον υπενεγκίον. Phil. l. iv. c. 4.

^y — ἀπαρὰ λαλῶν εἰκόνα τῆς τῷ πατρὶος ἑστίας εἶναι τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι λόγοις καὶ γραμμασι διαμαρτυρομένων. Id. l. ii. c. 15.

^z Basilus Ancyranus episcopus, artis Medicinæ, scripsit contra Marcellum, & de Virginitate librum, & nonnulla alia. Et sub rege Constantio Macedonianæ partis cum Eustathio Sebastiano princeps fuit. De V. l. c. 89.

^g ginity.

ginity, and some other things. In the time of Constantius he was together with Eustathius, bishop of Sebasta, the chief of the Macedonian faction.'

Basil, called also Basilas, as ^a Socrates says, was placed in the see of Ancyra by the council of Constantinople in 336, which deposed Marcellus.

In the year 351, he had a disputation at Sirmium with Photinus, which, as ^b Socrates says, was taken down in writing.

Epiphanius ^c reckons him among the chief of the Semi-Arians, who held the Son to be of like substance to the Father.

Sozomen says, he ^d was in esteem for eloquence and learning: or, as ^e Tillemont understands the last phrase, for his capacity to teach. And Theodoret says, that ^f this Basil and the above-mentioned Eustathius of Sebaste, were in great favour with the emperor Constantius for the sake of their piety.

For the rest of this bishop's history I would refer to ^g others.

7. Says Jerom, 'Eunomius ^h of the Arian faction, bishop of Cyzicum, breaking out into the open blasphemy of his heresy, so as to profess publicly what they hide, is said to live still in Cappadocia, and to write many things against the church. He has been answered by Apollinarius, Didymus, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory Nyssen.'

Eunomius was ordained bishop of Cyzicum by ⁱ Eudoxius and Maris, in the year 360; soon after which he was banished by Constantius. He suffered the like disgrace in the reign of Valens, and once more under Theodosius; who however at length suffered him to retire to some lands of his own at Dacora, ^k his native place in Cappadocia. The occasion of this last banishment, as Philostorgius says, was, that ^l the emperor understood he had perverted some of his courtiers, whilst he lived at Constantinople. Eunomius was alive in 392, when

^a L. ii. c. 42. p. 155. C. ^b — οὗτος ἔστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃν ἔγραψεν. Socr. l. ii. c. 30.

^c Hær. 73. n. i. p. 845. C. Compare Tillem. Les Ariens. Art. 66.

^d Καὶ βασιλεὺς δὲναι λί-
του, καὶ ἐπὶ παιδευσιὶ ὑπερλήμμενος.—Soz. l. ii. c. 33. sub in.

^e Qui avoit la
reputation d' esire un homme eloquent, &
fort capable d' instruire. Tillem. Les
Ariens. Art. 22. near the end.

^f Συνθεὶς δὲ πρὸς τοὺς τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ
πολλῶν ὁσῶς διὰ τὴν ἀξιοπαίριον βίωσιν ἀπὸ
λαλῶν παύσηται. Theod. l. ii. c. 25. f.

^g Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. Tillem. Histoire

des Ariens. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. 8. p. 347.

^h Eunomius, Ariane partis, Cyzicenus
episcopus, in apertam hæreseos suæ pro-
rumpens blasphemiam, ut quod illi tegunt,
ille publice fateretur, usque hodie vivere
dicitur in Cappadocia, & multa contra ec-
clesiam scribere. Responderunt ei Apol-
linarius, Didymus, Bazilius Cæsariensis,
Gregorius Nazianzenus, & Gregorius Nyf-
senus. De V. I. c. 129.

ⁱ Thdr. l. ii. c. 27. p. 113. D. Phil. l. v. c. 3.

^k Soz. l. vii. c. 17. in.

^l Phil. l. x. c. 6.

Jerom

Jerom wrote his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers. But he died not long after, about the year 394.

Eunomius was not only a disciple of Aëtius, but also his secretary, or amanuensis.

I shall transcribe here an article from Augustine's book of Heresies. 'The * Aëtians were so called from Aëtius, and are also called Eunomians from Eunomius, the disciple of Aëtius, by which name they are better known. For Eunomius being a better logician, was more successful in spreading that heresy, which holds the Son to be in all things unlike to the Father, and the Spirit to the Son. He is reported to have been so great an enemy to good thanners, as to have asserted that no man need to fear any harm, whatever vices he indulged, if he embraced the doctrines taught by him.'

This last charge too is in Epiphanius, from whom, I suppose, Augustine had it. And Theodoret says, he had heard of such things, but he does not know them to be true.

These people were also called Anomeans from the principle just mentioned; that the Son is unlike the Father. Epiphanius calls the heresy by that name, and says, that Aëtius was the author of it. Which is evident from things taken notice of by us formerly.

Let us now observe Eunomius's writings.

1.) A Commentary upon the epistle of Paul to the Romans, not extant; of which Socrates speaks in this manner: 'Eunomius, had but little skill in the sacred writings, and was not able to interpret them. With abundance of words, repeated and diversified, he never attained his purpose: which fully appears from his seven tomes upon the epistle of the apostle to the Romans; where wasting a great many words, he shews himself not able to represent the scope of the epistle.'

^m Ταχισταφος ὡν ἐκινῆ, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς παιδευθεὶς τὴν αἰρετικὴν διδασκ. Socrat. l. ii. c. 35. p. 130. C. Eunomius ὑπογραφεὺς γέγονεν Ἀσίου, τὸ ἐπικληθεὶς αὐτῶν. Id. l. iv. c. 7. sub in. * Aëtiani ab Aëtio sunt vocati, iidemque Eunomiani ab Eunomio Aëtii discipulo, quo nomine magis innotuerunt. Eunomius quippe in dialectica prævalens acutius & crebrius defendit hanc hæresim, dissimilem per omnia Patri asserens Filium, & Filio Spiritum Sanctum. Fertur etiam usque adeo fuisse bonis moribus inimicum, ut asseveraret, quod nihil cuique obesset, quorumlibet perpetratio ac perseverantia peccatorum, si hujus quæ ab illo docebatur fidei particeps esset. De

Hær. c. 54.

ⁿ Το δὲ σφάλειν ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ, ἢ ἵερα ἀμαρτία εἶναι ἵνα φασιν· Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔχει Θεός, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῇ μορῇ τῇ αὐτῶν νομιζομένη πρὸς τὴν. Epiph. Synopf. p. 810. Vid. & H. 76. n. iv.

^o H. Fab. l. iv. c. 3. p. 237. B. C.

^p Ἀνομοιοὶ πάλιν τινες εἰσιν καλούμενοι· ἔσχον δὲ ἀρχὴν Ἀσίον τινὰ διακόνου. H. 76. n. 1.

^q Οὐλομαθὸς μὲν ἔχον πρὸς τὰ ἱερά γραμμάτια — ὡς δὲ κινῆται αὐτῶν οἱ ἐπὶ τομοί, ὡς ἐμαλαιοποιήσιν ἐς τὸ πρὸς Ρωμαίους τε ἀποστολῇ ἐπιστολῇ· πολλὰς γὰρ λόγους εἰς αὐτῆς ἀναλωσας τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τὸν σκοπὸν λαβεῖν αὐτῶν δίδουσαι. l. iv. c. 7. p. 215. C.

2.) An

2.) An Apologetical Discourse, still ^a extant, answered by Basil in five books.

3.) An Exposition ^a or Confession of Faith, presented to the emperor Theodosius in 383, still ^a extant: upon which I would make the following remarks.

(1.) This Confession is in the common order of ancient creeds: first of God; then of Christ, his person, death, resurrection; then of the Holy Ghost, the resurrection of the body, the general judgment, eternal life: but nothing of Christ's descent into hell, nor of the catholic church, nor the communion of saints, nor the forgiveness of sins.

(2.) Here are references to many texts of scripture, particularly the first epistle ^a of Peter, and the ^a epistle to the Hebrews.

(3.) Here Eunomius says, that ^a Christ took man, consisting of soul and body. Nevertheless, Fabricius well observes, that ^a thereby is not to be understood a rational, but only a sensitive soul.

(4.) In this Confession Eunomius is truly an Arian. And yet he calls Christ our ^a God, the ^b only begotten God, and true God, but not unbegotten.

4.) Apology for an ^a Apology; a work in three parts, by way of answer to S. Basil. This ^a book was answered by Theodore, probably of Mopsuesta, Gregory Nyssen, and Sophronius, as we learn from Photius.

5.) Epistles. Photius assures us, that ^a Philostorgius, who extols all Eunomius's writings, still prefers the epistles to the rest. But Photius ^a himself, who had seen forty of them, says, they are written as if the author had not any knowledge of the rules of epistolary writings. A like censure he passeth upon the style of all Eunomius's works in general.

Philostorgius, who greatly admired both master and scholar, compared them together. He says, that ^a Aëtius excelled in

^a Ap. Fab. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 262. &c. & Canif. Lektion. A. T. i. & ap. Basilii opp. T. i. p. 618. ex edit. Bened.

^b Vid. Socr. l. v. c. 10. p. 269. A. Sozom. l. vii. c. 12. p. 719. B.

^c Ap. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 253. & alibi. ^d Ib. p. 253. & 257.

^e p. 257. ^f — αναλαβούσα τον εκ ψυχης και σωματος ανθρωπον. p. 257.

^g — ut per ψυχης non mentem, sed inferiorem modo animam sensibus constantem. Ib. p. 250. ^h Τη Θειη και σωτηρος ημων Ιησου Χριστου. n. i. p. 253.

ⁱ Περιεγουμεν εις τον τε Θεον Υιου, τον

μονογενη Θεου. — Χριστον αληθινον Θεον, εκ αληθινου. n. ii. p. 255. ^j Vid. Gr.

Nysf. contr. Eunom. l. i. p. 289, 298, 299.

^k — τω αυτη Eunomiu βιβλίου, η λογις τρισιν — η περιτυχοντες Θεοδωρος, και Γρηγοριος Νυσσης, και Σωφρωνιος. Phot. Cod. 138. p. 113. Vid. & Cod. 4, 5, 6. Conf. Philost. l. viii. c. 12. ^l Της δε λογις αυτη παντας αποθημαζων διαφεριν των αλλων επι μαλλον λαβει τας επιτολας. Philost. l. x. c. 6. fin. ^m — παντως τε των επιτολων χαρακτηρος εδω τας νομης ακουσας. Cod. 138. p. 314.

ⁿ Phil. l. viii. c. 18.

the force of reasoning, and readiness of answer: whilst Eunomius was more remarkable for perspicuity and method, whereby his instructions were more easily instilled into men.

I forbear to add any more, and for the rest would refer to other ^b writers, in whom may be found divers things omitted by me.

8. Says Jerom, 'Eusebius ¹ bishop of Emesa, a polite and agreeable writer, published innumerable pieces, suited to gain applause. And following the historical sense, he is much read by those who have occasion to speak in public. The chief of his works are these: Against the Jews, and against the Gentiles, against the Novatians, ten books upon the Epistle to the Galatians, and many short homilies upon the gospels. He flourished in the reign of the emperor Constantius, in whose time also he died. He was buried at Antioch.'

Eusebius flourished about the year 340, and died about the year 360, as Cave thinks. Fabricius roundly placeth his death ^m in 360, Tillemont ⁿ before 359.

Socrates ⁿ and Sozomen ^o had before them the Life of this bishop, written by his friend George of Laodicea. From whom we learn, that ^p Eusebius was descended of a very honourable family, and born at Edeffa in Mesopotamia. He was early instructed in the sacred scriptures, and then in secular learning, by a master at Edeffa. He afterwards came into Palestine, that he might farther perfect himself in sacred learning: where he studied under Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and Eusebius of Cæsarea. He likewise went to Antioch, and from thence to Alexandria, where he studied philosophy, and then returned to Antioch.

Some time after that, he was ordained bishop of Emesa in Phœnicia; but ^q the people could not endure him, having a

^b Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. Cav. H. L. in Eunomio. Canisii Lect. Antiq. T. i. Tillemont Les Ariens. art. 98. — 100.

¹ Eusebius Emisenus Episcopus, elegantis & rhetorici ingenii, innumerales, & qui ad plausum populi pertinent, confecit libros. Magisque historiam secutus, ab his qui declamare volunt studiosissime legitur. E quibus vel præcipue sunt adversum Judæos, & Gentes, & Novatianos, & ad Galatas libri decem, & in Evangelia homiliæ breves, sed plurimæ. Floruit temporibus Constantii Imperatoris, sub quo & mortuus. Antiochiæ sepultus est. De V. I. cap. 91.

¹ Bib. Gr. T. vi.

p. 160. T. viii. p. 366.

art. 31.

ⁿ Socr. l. ii. c. 9.

^o Soz. l. iii. c. 6.

^p — ως ἰν' ἐκ τῶν ἐνπαλίδων τῆς ἐν Μεσοποταμίᾳ Εδέσσης — ἐκ τῆς τῆς ἡλικίας τὰ ἱερά μαθητὰ γραμματὰ ἔβλεπε τὰ ἑλληνικὰ παιδαγωγία παρὰ τῶν τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκπαίδευσιν παρὰ διδασκάλου τῆς ἐκ τῆς Παλαιοφίλου καὶ Εὐσεβίου τὰ ἱερά ἐμπνευστὴ Βιβλία — κατὰ λαβεῖν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, κακεὶ μαθεῖν τὰ φιλοσοφία. Socr. l. ii. c. 9. Conf. Soz. l. iii. c. 6.

^q Διαφασιστὴν δὲ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἐπὶ τῇ χειρολογίᾳ αὐτῆς ἐλοιδόρειτο γὰρ, ὡς μαθητὴ μαλίστη ἀσκημένος, φύσιν χρησταί. Socr. ubi sup. p. 86. A.

notion, that he practised magical arts. Such is the reward which some men meet with for a diligent application to letters! And upon another occasion, as Sozomen relates, good^r and great as he was, he experienced the envy of those, who are offended at other men's virtues. However, the emperor^s Constantius was greatly pleased with him, and always carried him with him in his wars against the Persians.

His^t piety, as well as his learning and eloquence, appears to have been at that time very conspicuous.

Theodoret says, that^u his writings shewed him to be an Arian. And in Jerom's Chronicle he is called^x a standard-bearer of the Arians. Nevertheless Jerom has elsewhere owned, that^y Diodorus of Tarsus, and^z John Chrysostom imitated him, as a good model of writing.

Jerom in the article from his Catalogue mentions several of our Eusebius's works: and Sozomen says^a in general, that he wrote many books, and speaks of them with commendation: and reckons him among the most noted and eminent persons that flourished in the church at that time. Beside the works mentioned by Jerom, we know from Epiphanius^b and Theodoret, that^c he wrote a piece against the Manichees.

Theodoret has transcribed a long^d passage from some work of this writer; and fragments of him may be found in some other places: but in general his works are lost.

His work against the Jews is said to be still in the library at Vienna. But as it has not been published, it is not easy to form a sure judgment about it. The Homilies, which have been published under his name, are now allowed to belong to^e others.

Ebedjesu in his Catalogue mentions^f a book of Questions upon the Old Testament, not taken notice of by Greek or Latin authors.

^r Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ὄντας, ὡς διὰ τὴν τοῦ φθόνου τὴν ἀνασταθμίσαντα ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀλλὰ ἀρεταῖς. Soz. l. iii. c. 6. p. 504. c.

^s Εὐσεβίου δὲ καὶ τῶν τῶν βασιλέων περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων. κ. λ. ib. p. 504. B. ^t Ὡς ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν πολλοῖς πολέμοις, καὶ λείπει τῶν πραγμάτων οὕτως. — Ib. p. 504. A.

^u Εὐσεβίου τοῖς τοῖς συγγραμμάσι, καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοῖς Ἀρίων συμπεριλαμβανόμενοι δογμασι. Dial. 3. p. 171. D.

^x Eusebius episcopus Emisenus Arianae signifer factionis multa & varia describit. Chr. p. 183.

^y Exstant ejus in Apostolum commenta-

rii, & multa alia, ad Eusebii magis Emiseni characterem pertinentia. De V. l. c. 119.

^z Eusebii Emiseni, Diodorici sectator. Ib. c. 129.

^a Soz. l. iii. c. 14. p. 522. C. D.

^b H. 66. n. 21.

^c H. Fab. l. i. c. ult. fin.

^d Dial. 3. p. 171—175.

^e Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. & Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. 6. p. 107, 108.

^f Eusebius Emessenus composuit librum adversus Judaeos, & Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, & Homiliam de Stephano.

Ebed. ap. Assen. B. O. T. iii. p. 44.

9. Eusebius ^z at first bishop of Berytus in Phœnicia, then of Nicomedia, the chief city of Bithynia, was advanced to the see of Constantinople in 338 or 339, and died about the year 341.

He was present at the council of Nice in 325, and after some hesitation signed the creed there composed. Nevertheless, having given some offence, he and Theognis were banished by Constantine, in ^b three months time after the breaking up of the council. Upon submission made by them, they were ⁱ both restored to their sees in the latter part of the year 328, or the beginning of 329. And Amphion, who had been put in Eusebius's room at Nicomedia, and Chrestus, who had been made bishop of Nice instead of Theognis, were removed.

Nothing remains of Eusebius, that is undoubtedly genuine, except a letter to Paulinus bishop of Tyre, preserved by ^h Theodoret.

Ammianus says, that ^l he was related at a distance to the emperor Julian; and possibly therefore to Constantine likewise. Unquestionably, Eusebius was a man of great abilities: the eminence of the sees of Nicomedia, and then of Constantinople, in which he presided, gave him an advantage, as he was always near the court. But his own address was what principally rendered him so capable to forward the Arian interests, as he did. Sozomen, not to mention the praises bestowed on him by Eusebius of Cæsarea, and others, his particular ^m friends, owns ⁿ he was a learned man.

10. 'Euzoius,' says ^o Jerom, 'when young, was educated at Cæsarea, together with Gregory Nazianzen, by Thespesius the rhetorician. And, when afterwards bishop of that city, he took a great deal of pains to repair the library of Origen and Pamphilus, which had suffered very much in the persecutions. At length in the reign of Theodosius he was expelled the church. Many treatises of his, upon various subjects, are in being, and may be easily had.'

^z They who are desirous to make farther enquiries concerning this bishop, may consult Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vi. p. 109, 110. Cav. Hist. Lit. Tillem. Les Ariens. T. vi. and elsewhere.

^b Vid. Philost. l. i. c. 9.

ⁱ Vid. Socr. l. i. c. 23.

Soz. l. i. c. 21.

^k Theod. l. i. c. 6.

^l — ibidem ab Eusebio educatus episcopo, quem genere longius contingebat.

Amm. l. xxii. c. 9.

^m — ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{jj} ^{jk} ^{jl} ^{jm} ^{jn} ^{jo} ^{jp} ^{jq} ^{jr} ^{js} ^{jt} ^{ju} ^{jv} ^{jw} ^{jx} ^{ky} ^{kz} ^{la} ^{lb} ^{lc} ^{ld} ^{le} ^{lf} ^{lg} ^{lh} ^{li} ^{lj} ^{lk} ^{ll} ^{lm} ^{ln} ^{lo} ^{lp} ^{lq} ^{lr} ^{ls} ^{lt} ^{lu} ^{lv} ^{lw} ^{lx} ^{ly} ^{lz} ^{ma} ^{mb} ^{mc} ^{md} ^{me} ^{mf} ^{mg} ^{mh} ^{mi} ^{mj} ^{mk} ^{ml} ^{mm} ^{mn} ^{mo} ^{mp} ^{mq} ^{mr} ^{ms} ^{mt} ^{mu} ^{mv} ^{mw} ^{mx} ^{my} ^{mz} ^{na} ^{nb} ^{nc} nd ^{ne} ^{nf} ^{ng} ^{nh} ⁿⁱ ^{nj} ^{nk} ^{nl} ^{nm} ⁿⁿ ^{no} ^{np} ^{nq} ^{nr} ^{ns} ^{nt} ^{nu} ^{nv} ^{nw} ^{nx} ^{ny} ^{nz} ^{oa} ^{ob} ^{oc} ^{od} ^{oe} ^{of} ^{og} ^{oh} ^{oi} ^{oj} ^{ok} ^{ol} ^{om} ^{on} ^{oo} ^{op} ^{oq} ^{or} ^{os} ^{ot} ^{ou} ^{ov} ^{ow} ^{ox} ^{oy} ^{oz} ^{pa} ^{pb} ^{pc} ^{pd} ^{pe} ^{pf} ^{pg} ^{ph} ^{pi} ^{pj} ^{pk} ^{pl} ^{pm} ^{pn} ^{po} ^{pp} ^{pq} ^{pr} ^{ps} ^{pt} ^{pu} ^{pv} ^{pw} ^{px} ^{py} ^{pz} ^{qa} ^{qb} ^{qc} ^{qd} ^{qe} ^{qf} ^{qg} ^{qh} ^{qi} ^{qj} ^{qk} ^{ql} ^{qm} ^{qn} ^{qo} ^{qp} ^{qq} ^{qr} ^{qs} ^{qt} ^{qu} ^{qv} ^{qw} ^{qx} ^{qy} ^{qz} ^{ra} ^{rb} ^{rc} rd ^{re} ^{rf} ^{rg} ^{rh} ^{ri} ^{rj} ^{rk} ^{rl} ^{rm} ^{rn} ^{ro} ^{rp} ^{rq} ^{rr} ^{rs} ^{rt} ^{ru} ^{rv} ^{rw} ^{rx} ^{ry} ^{rz} ^{sa} ^{sb} ^{sc} ^{sd} ^{se} ^{sf} ^{sg} ^{sh} ^{si} ^{sj} ^{sk} ^{sl} sm ^{sn} ^{so} ^{sp} ^{sq} ^{sr} ^{ss} st ^{su} ^{sv} ^{sw} ^{sx} ^{sy} ^{sz} ^{ta} ^{tb} ^{tc} ^{td} ^{te} ^{tf} ^{tg} th ^{ti} ^{tj} ^{tk} ^{tl} tm ^{tn} ^{to} ^{tp} ^{tq} ^{tr} ^{ts} ^{tt} ^{tu} ^{tv} ^{tw} ^{tx} ^{ty} ^{tz} ^{ua} ^{ub} ^{uc} ^{ud} ^{ue} ^{uf} ^{ug} ^{uh} ^{ui} ^{uj} ^{uk} ^{ul} ^{um} ^{un} ^{uo} ^{up} ^{uq} ^{ur} ^{us} ^{ut} ^{uu} ^{uv} ^{uw} ^{ux} ^{uy} ^{uz} ^{va} ^{vb} ^{vc} ^{vd} ^{ve} ^{vf} ^{vg} ^{vh} ^{vi} ^{vj} ^{vk} ^{vl} ^{vm} ^{vn} ^{vo} ^{vp} ^{vq} ^{vr} ^{vs} ^{vt} ^{vu} ^{vv} ^{vw} ^{vx} ^{vy} ^{vz} ^{wa} ^{wb} ^{wc} ^{wd} ^{we} ^{wf} ^{wg} ^{wh} ^{wi} ^{wj} ^{wk} ^{wl} ^{wm} ^{wn} ^{wo} ^{wp} ^{wq} ^{wr} ^{ws} ^{wt} ^{wu} ^{wv} ^{ww} ^{wx} ^{wy} ^{wz} ^{xa} ^{xb} ^{xc} ^{xd} ^{xe} ^{xf} ^{xg} ^{xh} ^{xi} ^{xj} ^{xk} ^{xl} ^{xm} ^{xn} ^{xo} ^{xp} ^{xq} ^{xr} ^{xs} ^{xt} ^{xu} ^{xv} ^{xw} ^{xx} ^{xy} ^{xz} ^{ya} ^{yb} ^{yc} ^{yd} ^{ye} ^{yf} ^{yg} ^{yh} ^{yi} ^{yj} ^{yk} ^{yl} ^{ym} ^{yn} ^{yo} ^{yp} ^{yq} ^{yr} ^{ys} ^{yt} ^{yu} ^{yv} ^{yw} ^{yx} ^{yy} ^{yz} ^{za} ^{zb} ^{zc} ^{zd} ^{ze} ^{zf} ^{zg} ^{zh} ^{zi} ^{zj} ^{zk} ^{zl} ^{zm} ^{zn} ^{zo} ^{zp} ^{zq} ^{zr} ^{zs} ^{zt} ^{zu} ^{zv} ^{zw} ^{zx} ^{zy} ^{zz}

Phil. l. i. c. 8.

^o — ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{jj} ^{jk} ^{jl} ^{jm} ^{jn} ^{jo} ^{jp} ^{jq} ^{jr} ^{js} ^{jt} ^{ju} ^{jv} ^{jw} ^{jx} ^{ky} ^{kz} ^{la} ^{lb} ^{lc} ^{ld} ^{le} ^{lf} ^{lg} ^{lh} ^{li} ^{lj} ^{lk} ^{ll} ^{lm} ^{ln} ^{lo} ^{lp} ^{lq} ^{lr} ^{ls} ^{lt} ^{lu} ^{lv} ^{lw} ^{lx} ^{ly} ^{lz} ^{ma} ^{mb} ^{mc} ^{md} ^{me} ^{mf} ^{mg} ^{mh} ^{mi} ^{mj} ^{mk} ^{ml} ^{mm} ^{mn} ^{mo} ^{mp} ^{mq} ^{mr} ^{ms} ^{mt} ^{mu} ^{mv} ^{mw} ^{mx} ^{my} ^{mz} ^{na} ^{nb} ^{nc} nd ^{ne} ^{nf} ^{ng} ^{nh} ⁿⁱ ^{nj} ^{nk} ^{nl} ^{nm} ⁿⁿ ^{no} ^{np} ^{nq} ^{nr} ^{ns} ^{nt} ^{nu} ^{nv} ^{nw} ^{nx} ^{ny} ^{nz} ^{oa} ^{ob} ^{oc} ^{od} ^{oe} ^{of} ^{og} ^{oh} ^{oi} ^{oj} ^{ok} ^{ol} ^{om} ^{on} ^{oo} ^{op} ^{oq} ^{or} ^{os} ^{ot} ^{ou} ^{ov} ^{ow} ^{ox} ^{oy} ^{oz} ^{pa} ^{pb} ^{pc} ^{pd} ^{pe} ^{pf} ^{pg} ^{ph} ^{pi} ^{pj} ^{pk} ^{pl} ^{pm} ^{pn} ^{po} ^{pp} ^{pq} ^{pr} ^{ps} ^{pt} ^{pu} ^{pv} ^{pw} ^{px} ^{py} ^{pz} ^{qa} ^{qb} ^{qc} ^{qd} ^{qe} ^{qf} ^{qg} ^{qh} ^{qi} ^{qj} ^{qk} ^{ql} ^{qm} ^{qn} ^{qo} ^{qp} ^{qq} ^{qr} ^{qs} ^{qt} ^{qu} ^{qv} ^{qw} ^{qx} ^{qy} ^{qz} ^{ra} ^{rb} ^{rc} rd ^{re} ^{rf} ^{rg} ^{rh} ^{ri} ^{rj} ^{rk} ^{rl} ^{rm} ^{rn} ^{ro} ^{rp} ^{rq} ^{rr} ^{rs} ^{rt} ^{ru} ^{rv} ^{rw} ^{rx} ^{ry} ^{rz} ^{sa} ^{sb} ^{sc} ^{sd} ^{se} ^{sf} ^{sg} ^{sh} ^{si} ^{sj} ^{sk} ^{sl} sm ^{sn} ^{so} ^{sp} ^{sq} ^{sr} ^{ss} st ^{su} ^{sv} ^{sw} ^{sx} ^{sy} ^{sz} ^{ta} ^{tb} ^{tc} ^{td} ^{te} ^{tf} ^{tg} th ^{ti} ^{tj} ^{tk} ^{tl} tm ^{tn} ^{to} ^{tp} ^{tq} ^{tr} ^{ts} ^{tt} ^{tu} ^{tv} ^{tw} ^{tx} ^{ty} ^{tz} ^{ua} ^{ub} ^{uc} ^{ud} ^{ue} ^{uf} ^{ug} ^{uh} ^{ui} ^{uj} ^{uk} ^{ul} ^{um} ^{un} ^{uo} ^{up} ^{uq} ^{ur} ^{us} ^{ut} ^{uu} ^{uv} ^{uw} ^{ux} ^{uy} ^{uz} ^{va} ^{vb} ^{vc} ^{vd} ^{ve} ^{vf} ^{vg} ^{vh} ^{vi} ^{vj} ^{vk} ^{vl} ^{vm} ^{vn} ^{vo} ^{vp} ^{vq} ^{vr} ^{vs} ^{vt} ^{vu} ^{vv} ^{vw} ^{vx} ^{vy} ^{vz} ^{wa} ^{wb} ^{wc} ^{wd} ^{we} ^{wf} ^{wg} ^{wh} ^{wi} ^{wj} ^{wk} ^{wl} ^{wm} ^{wn} ^{wo} ^{wp} ^{wq} ^{wr} ^{ws} ^{wt} ^{wu} ^{wv} ^{ww} ^{wx} ^{wy} ^{wz} ^{xa} ^{xb} ^{xc} ^{xd} ^{xe} ^{xf} ^{xg} ^{xh} ^{xi} ^{xj} ^{xk} ^{xl} ^{xm} ^{xn} ^{xo} ^{xp} ^{xq} ^{xr} ^{xs} ^{xt} ^{xu} ^{xv} ^{xw} ^{xx} ^{xy} ^{xz} ^{ya} ^{yb} ^{yc} ^{yd} ^{ye} ^{yf} ^{yg} ^{yh} ^{yi} ^{yj} ^{yk} ^{yl} ^{ym} ^{yn} ^{yo} ^{yp} ^{yq} ^{yr} ^{ys} ^{yt} ^{yu} ^{yv} ^{yw} ^{yx} ^{yy} ^{yz} ^{za} ^{zb} ^{zc} ^{zd} ^{ze} ^{zf} ^{zg} ^{zh} ^{zi} ^{zj} ^{zk} ^{zl} ^{zm} ^{zn} ^{zo} ^{zp} ^{zq} ^{zr} ^{zs} ^{zt} ^{zu} ^{zv} ^{zw} ^{zx} ^{zy} ^{zz}

Euzoius succeeded ^a Acacius, in 366, or soon after, and was deposed in 379 or 380.

Jerom does in another place speak of these repairs of the library at Cæsarea. The passage seems to be curious; I therefore transcribe it largely at the bottom of the ^a page.

Cave ^r speaks honourably of Euzoius: but none of his works remain, no, not the titles of them; though Jerom says, they might be easily had in his time.

Euzoius is mentioned by Epiphanius ^a among those, whom he calls Semi-Arians.

II. George, bishop of Laodicea, flourished, as Cave says, about the year 340. He wrote the Life of Eusebius bishop of Emesa, which ^a Socrates and ^b Sozomen made use of. He likewise published a book against the Manichees, mentioned by ^c Theodoret and ^d Photius. And Sozomen ^e has a short, but warm letter of his against Aëtius.

He was a native of ^a Alexandria, and at first presbyter there, before he was bishop. George is often mentioned, and sometimes quoted by ^b Athanasius. Theodoret says, that ^c though he was an Arian, he was a great philosopher. Nor has Philostorgius failed to observe, that ^d before he was made bishop, he made good progress in philosophy.

One thing however, perhaps, is not to the honour of this Arian bishop and philosopher, that in his Life of his friend Eusebius, bishop of Emesa, he ^e relates many miracles to have been done by him. This, in all probability, ought to be ascribed to credulity or partiality.

Beaufobre particularly laments the loss of two books, written against the Manichees, ^f which ^g probably were very excellent

^a V. Cav. in Euzoio. ^q Beatus Pamphilus martyr — quum Demetrium Phalereum & Pistratum in sacrae bibliothecæ studio vellet æquare — tunc vel maxime Origenis libros impensius profectus, Cæsariensi ecclesiæ dedicavit: quam ex parte corruptam Acacius, dehinc & Euzoius ejusdem ecclesiæ sacerdotes in membranarum restaurare conati sunt. Hic cum multa repeterit, & inventorum nobis indicem reliquerit, centesimi vigesimi sexti Psalmi commentarium, & Phe literæ tractatum, ex eo quod non inscripsit, confessus est non repertum. Non quod talis tantusque vir (Adamantium dicimus) aliquid præterierit: sed quod negligentia posterorum ad nostram usque memoriam non duravit. Ad Marcellum. Opp. T. ii. p. 171. al. Ep. 141.

^r Vir plane doctus ac diligens. Ubi supr.

^s H. 73. n. 37. p. 683. C. ^t L.

ii. c. 9. ^u L. iii. c. 6.

^x H. F. l. i. c. ult. fin. ^y Cod. 85.

^z Vid. Sozom. l. iv. c. 13. ^a Vid.

Philost. l. viii. c. 17. ^b Γεωργιος δε ο

νυν εν Λαοδικειᾳ, πρωτοπρεσβυτερος μεν εν τῇ

τῇ Αλεξανδρειᾳ. De Synod. n. 17. p.

731. B. ^c — αὐτῆς τῆς μεν ἀριστερῆς

προσταυρῶν αἰρεσεως, τοις δε φιλοσοφοις ἐν-

τετραμμενος μαθημασι. H. F. l. i. c. ult. f.

^d Καὶ Γεωργιος δε Αλεξανδρεως μεν το γε-

νος, καὶ τῶν ἐκ φιλοσοφίας ορμαινῶν. —

Phil. l. viii. c. 17. ^e Τελευταῖον δε

εἶπας — καὶ οἱ τετρακτὰ ἐν τοις χερσιν

αὐτῆς εἶναι. Socr. l. ii. c. 9. p. 86. B.

Λεξιᾶι γὰρ πολλὰ δι' αὐτῆς θαυμαστήρησαι

το Θεον, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Γεωργιος ο Λαοδικεως.

— Soz. l. iii. c. 6. p. 504. B.

^f See Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 223, 224.

‘ and valuable, as may be concluded from the capacity of the
 ‘ authors. The first is that of George bishop of Laodicea,
 ‘ whom Athanasius decries as the worst of all men, because he
 ‘ was one of the principal supports of Arianism: to whom
 ‘ however Theodoret bears witness, as one of the greatest phi-
 ‘ losophers of his time. The second book is that of Eusebius
 ‘ of Emesa. This bishop, being born at Edessa in Mesopo-
 ‘ tamia, understood Syriac, which was the vulgar tongue of
 ‘ the province, and was able to read the works of Mani in
 ‘ the original. Moreover he lived at a time, when the me-
 ‘ mory of his life and actions was fresh, and in places where
 ‘ he saw many of his followers. All this, joined with uncom-
 ‘ mon knowledge and eloquence, rendered Eusebius the most
 ‘ proper man in the world to teach us both the history and the
 ‘ opinions of that heresiarch. But the envy of the Greeks, or
 ‘ their immoderate zeal against the Arians, has caused the
 ‘ loss of all the works of this excellent personage, except a few
 ‘ remains preserved by the Syrians.’

12. Lucius, the Arian bishop at Alexandria after Athana-
 sius, as ^s Jerom says, published some small pieces upon divers
 subjects: for which cause Jerom has given him a place in his
 Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, and I have put his words
 at the bottom of the page, and refer to some others ^b for a
 fuller account.

13. Maximin, an Arian bishop, with whom Augustine in
 the year 427 or 428, had a public disputation or conference,
 still ⁱ extant. And soon after that conference, Augustine wrote
 two books against Maximin, likewise in being. Having al-
 ready ^k exhibited his testimony to the scriptures, I need not
 add any thing farther here.

14. Philostorgius was born about the year ^l 368, at a village
 in Cappadocia. His ^m father's name was Carterius, his mother's
 Eulampia, only daughter of a presbyter named Anysius, who
 however had four sons besides. His mother's ancestors, both
 by the father's and mother's side, were Homousians: but Car-
 terius was a follower of Eunomius. He brought over his wife
 to his own opinion; she persuaded her brothers, and at length
 her father and other relations. Of this opinion Philostorgius
 makes open profession; that is, he did not believe the Son of

^s Lucius post Athanasium Arianæ partis
 episcopus usque ad Theodosium principem,
 a quo est pulsus, Alexandrinam ecclesiam
 tenuit. Exstant ejus solennes de Pascha
 epistolæ, & pauci variarum hypothescon
 libelli. De V. I. c. 118.

^b Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. & Tillem. Les
 Ariens. Art. 123. &c. ⁱ Vid. Augul.

Opp. T. viii. ^k See p. 118—119.

^l Vid. Cav. Hist. L. T. i. p. 410.

^m Vid. Philost. L. ix, c. 9.

God to be like the Father. When he was twenty ^a years of age, he went to Constantinople, to improve himself in learning.

His Ecclesiastical History, in ^o two parts, making in all twelve books, was published about the year 425, in the time of the emperor Theodosius the younger, in whose reign likewise wrote those other historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret; containing the history of affairs from the beginning of the Arian controversy, or about the year 300, to that time. The work itself is lost, but we have large extracts made by Photius. Beside that history, as he himself informs us, he wrote an ^p encomium of Eunomius, and ^q a book against Porphyry in defence of the Christian religion. Philostorgius was undoubtedly ^a man of a great deal of knowledge and learning, and Photius commends his ^r style; nevertheless, he may be said to be remarkably credulous. In his brief account of Philostorgius's history Photius observes, that ^s he extols Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theophilus the Indian, and many others, as eminent for miracles, as well as for piety of life and conversation.

I apprehend it may be worth the while to take notice of some other instances of credulity and superstition in this learned and zealous Arian.

He highly commends, as Photius ^t says, Constantius, and says, that he built the church at Constantinople, which is called, and really is great: and that he brought from Achaia the apostle Andrew, and placed him in the church he had built, called also the church of the apostles; near to which he set his father's tomb. He also translated from the same Achaia Luke the evangelist, and to the same temple. Finally, in like manner he caused to be brought the apostle Timothy from Ephesus in Ionia, to the same celebrated and venerable church.

So writes Philostorgius, with manifest signs of approbation. And I suppose, these to be some ^u of the very first translations of reliques. But they are mentioned by some other writers in a different order. For the author of the Paschal Chronicle first ^x mentions the translation of the reliques of Timothy in 356, and then the reliques of Luke and Andrew in the next year. And he says of those last, that ^y by order of the emperor Constantius, the reliques of those holy apostles were brought to Constantinople, with much care and veneration, with sing-

ⁿ Id. l. x. c. 6.

^o Vid. Phot.

και αλλως πλειονας. Cod. 40. p. 30.

cod. 40.

^p l. iii. c. 21.

^t Philost. l. iii. c. 2.

^u Vid.

^q l. x. c. 10.

^r Cod. 40.

Basnage Ann. 356. n. xi. &c. & Basnage Hist. de l'Eglise, liv. 19. ch. iv. n. vi.

^s Εν τερατιοις δε και βιω Ευσεβιον του Νικημοδιου, — και Θεοφιλον του Ινδου,

^x Chr. Pasch. p. 293. B.

^y Ibid.

ing of psalms and hymns, and were deposited in the church of the holy Apostles. St. Jerom's manner of speaking, leads us to consider this as a very early instance ^z of this kind of translations.

It is our author who says, that ^a Lucian after his martyrdom was brought by a dolphin to the bay of Nicomedia: near to which place was afterwards built the city of Helenopolis.

Beside many wonderful appearances related by other historians, by which Julian's attempt to build the temple of Jerusalem was frustrated, Philostorgius tells this strange story: 'At ^b clearing the foundation a stone was taken up that covered the ^c mouth of a cave, cut out in the rock, into which one of the ^d labourers being let down by a long rope, found it full of ^e water to the middle of the leg. Having carefully viewed ^f the cave on every side, he found it to be four-square. This ^g was the report he then made. Being let down again, he observed a pillar reaching a little above the water, whereon lay ^h a book wrapped up in clean and fine linen. Being drawn ⁱ up, the linen was seen to be fresh and fair. And at the front ^j of the book was found written in capital letters, to the great ^k surprize of all, but especially of Jews and Gentiles, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*' This is related by no other writer of that time. For which reason, as Cave ^l well observes, ^m it stands upon the single authority of Philostorgius: though he is pleased to add: ⁿ but he ancient enough, being born ^o within five years after the thing was done.'

He says, the ^p empress, wife of Constantius, was miraculously cured of a certain distemper by Theophilus the Indian.

Photius says, that the ninth book of Philostorgius's history contains many ^q wonderful works of Aëtius, Eunomius and Leontius, forged by the author, as also of Euagrius, and Arrianus, and Florentius, especially of Theophilus the Indian, and some others; which ^r nothing but a bigotted zeal could make him invent: yet he relates them without any restraint from a sense of shame of their absurdity and improbability.

He has many stories of judgments ^s befalling the apostates from Christianity, in the time of Julian; and another judg-

^z Sacrilegus fuit Constantius Imperator, qui sanctas reliquas Andree, Lucae Timothei transfudit Constantinopolim?—Adv. Vig. p. 283. in.

^a L. ii. c. 12.

^b L. vii. c. 14. ^c Life of St. Cyril of Jerus. in English. cap. x. p. 353.

^d L. iv. c. 7.

^e — αἰὼν χειρῶν

ὑπερβυνη εἶσα. — διαπλατῆι. l. ix. c. 1. in.

^f Οὐς ἡ αὐτὴ τῆς ἀσέβειας λυσσα δερμίδεως ἐπιδεικνύει καὶ ταῦτα κατὰ τὴν ἀπὸ θανάτου ἀναπλατῆος, ὑδῆμα παρὰ αἰσθησὶς τῆς ἀλοπίας ἀνακυφίσασα. ib.

^g L. vii. c. 10, 11, & 13.

p. 320.

ment^b upon a wicked man, who endeavoured to shelter himself in communion with Athanasius.

Speaking of things that happened in his own time, he says, that^c in several places there fell hail as large as a man could grasp in his hand; and some pieces were found to weigh eight pounds.

I forbear to mention any more of these wonders; but I shall refer in the margin to a place or two^d more.

I proceed to take some things in him relating to the Scriptures.

At the beginning of his large extracts Photius observes that Philostorgius says, he^e does not know who is the author of the books of the Maccabees. He esteems the first of those books very valuable, as agreeable to the prophecies of Daniel.—Moreover he says, that the second book does not appear to be written by the same author.—The third book he much dislikes. The fourth book, he says, was written by Josephus.

He blames some people for sitting when^f the gospels were read.

He speaks of Aëtius^g having first with care studied the evangelists, then the epistles of Paul, after that the Prophets, particularly Ezekiel: which was mentioned formerly: as have been also divers other things, relating to the scriptures, in the history of several, taken from this writer.

15. Sabinus. Cave^h supposeth him to have flourished about the year 425. For what reason he placed him so late I cannot tell. Tillemont agrees, thatⁱ he wrote in the time of Valens: and Fabricius, under^j Valens or Gratian.

By Socrates we are informed, that^k Sabinus was bishop of the Macedonians at Heraclea in Thrace. He sometimes calls Sabinus a^l leader of the Macedonian sect, and a^m Semi-arian. He wrote a History of Councils, beginning with that at Nice. The title of his book seemsⁿ to have been a collection of Synods, or of the Acts of Synods. This author is often quoted

^b L. iii. c. 12.^c L. xi. cap. 7.

Art. 107. med.

^d — cujus col-^e Vid. l. iii. c. 26. l. ix. c. 2. l. x. c. 9, 11.^f L. i. c. 1.^g Καί

γὰρ καθίζοντες τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν ἀναγνώσ-

μαίων ποιεῖν τὴν ἀκρόασιν. L. iii. c. 5.

^h — παρ' ὧς τῆς εὐαγγελιστῆς ἀνάγνως,

καὶ τοῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπιστολαῖς, — ἐφ' ὧ

ταῖς τε ἀποστολῇ ἀναδιδάχθεις ἐπιστολαῖς. —

κ. λ. l. iii. c. 15. p. 481. B. C.

ⁱ H. L. T. i. p. 41.^j Je ne sçay,

si cette retenue de Sabin à leur égard ne

marqueroit point, qu'il écrivoit sous Va-

lens, dans le temps que les purs Ariens

étoient encore toutpuissans. Les Ariens.

lectionem—a Concilio Nicæno usque ad Valentis tempora, sub quo, vel sub Gratiano scripsisse videtur. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. 6. p. 119. not. 1.

^k Σάβινος γὰρ, ὁ τῶν ἐν Ἡρακλείᾳ τῆς Θράκης Μακεδονιανῶν ἐπίσκοπος. κ. λ. l. i. c. 8. p. 20. A.^l Σάβινος ὁ τῆς Μακεδονικῆς αἰρέσεως πρό-

εδρος. l. i. c. 9. p. 31. D. Vid. & l. ii. c.

15.

^m Ἀριανίζων γὰρ τιμίμω. l. iv.

c. 22. p. 231. B.

ⁿ — ἐν τῇ συ-

γασμῇ τῶν συνόδων. l. ii. c. 17. p. 95. B.

τῇ συναθροίᾳ τῶν συνόδων Σάβινω. l. iii. c.

25. p. 204. D.

by Socrates, who took some materials from him for his own work. Socrates does likewise several times complain of his partiality^x, in suppressing and concealing divers things which did not make for the honour of his party. And the justness of those remarks must, I think, be allowed by every one who reads them in Socrates.

16. Says Jerome: 'Theodore^y bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, in the time of the emperor Constantius, published Commentaries upon Matthew and John, and upon the Apostle, and upon the Psalter, in a neat and elegant style, explaining chiefly the literal sense.'

Cave computes, that^z he was made bishop of Heraclea about the year 334. Tillemont says, that^a he was put in that see some time before the year 334, but in what year is uncertain. The time of his episcopate is collected from a passage of^b Theodoret. Athanasius expressly says, that he^c was promoted by the Arians. He was deposed by the synod of Sardica in 347. He died, as some think, in^d 355, others about the year^e 358. Theodoret reckons him with Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice, one^f of the prime adversaries of Athanasius. He nevertheless owns, that^g he was a very learned man, and wrote a Commentary upon the divine gospels.

Jerom has elsewhere plainly mentioned this bishop's^h Commentary upon the Psalms; and refers also, as it seems, to hisⁱ Commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians.

It is supposed by^k Cave, and^l Fabricius, that his Commentary upon the Psalms is still extant entire. Tillemont only says: It^m is thought, that we still have his Commentary upon the Psalms, and some fragments of what he wrote on St. Matthew. I must own likewise, that it appears to me very doubtful, whether the Commentary upon the Psalms, published

^x Vid. l. ii. c. 15. p. 92. & c. 17. p. 95. l. iv. c. 22. ^y Theodorus, Heracleæ Thraciarum episcopus, elegantis apertique sermonis, & magis historice intelligentiæ, edidit sub Constantio Principe commentarios in Matthæum & in Joannem, & in Apostolum, & in Psalterium. De V. l. cap. 90.

^z Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 203. ^a Les Ariens Art. 20.

^b L. i. c. 28. ^c Ad Episc. Æg.

& Lib. p. 277. A. ^d Fabr. Bib.

Gr. T. viii. p. 419. ^e Cav. ubi sup.

^f Vid. Thdr. H. E. l. i. c. 28. l. ii. c.

3. & 8. l. v. c. 7. ^g Ελλοβίμος δι

διαφοροῦς ο Θεόδωρος ην, και δη και των
Θεων αναγγελων την εφημεριαν συγγραφει.

l. ii. c. 3. p. 71. B. ^h — maxime in

explanatione Psalmorum, quos apud Græcos interpretati sunt nullus voluminibus primus Origenes, secundus Eusebius Cæsariensis, tertius Theodorus Heracleotes.

Hier. ad Aug. Ep. 73. al. 95. p. 627. in.

ⁱ Prætermitto Didymum, — Eusebium

quoque Emisenum, & Theodorum Heracleotem: qui & ipsi nonnullos super hac re

commentarios reliquerunt. Ib. p. 619. in.

^k Ex his exstat nonnisi commentarius integer in Psalmos. Cav. ib. p. 203.

^l Commentarium Theodori in Psalmos

integrum cum Patrum in Psalmos Catena

Corderius edidit. Fabr. ubi sup. p. 412.

^m Les Ariens Art. 21. sub fin.

by Corderius, be justly ascribed to this Bishop of Heraclea in its present condition. It is however well written, and there are in it many good observations. The author (if the remarks of several are not there mixed together,) received ^a the epistle to the Hebrew's as St. Paul's.

17. I may not omit Ulphilas, but must aim at brevity, and refer to others, both ^o ancients and ^p moderns, for a more particular account.

Cave supposeth him to have flourished chiefly about the year 365.

Socrates says, that ^h Ulphilas subscribed the Arian Creed of the council held at Constantinople in 360, who before had followed the Nicene faith, which had been signed by Theophilus, bishop of the Goths, who was present at that council.

It seems, that ^r in the time of the emperor Valens, the Christians of that country were brought more generally into the Arian scheme than they had been before. Theodoret expressly says, that ^s the Goths had long before received the rays of divine light, and until that time had been nourished in the apostolical doctrine. He adds, that ^t even after that alteration they believed indeed the Father to be greater than the Son; but they did not call the Son a creature, though they communicated with those who did so.

Ulphilas was in great authority with that people, and very useful to them. He cultivated among them civility and learning, and made many converts to the Christian religion. He ^u invented for them an alphabet, and translated the scriptures of the Old and New Testament into their language: excepting only, as Philostorgius ^x says, the books of the kingdoms, [meaning, it is likely, the two book of Samuel, the two books of the Kings, and the books of the Chronicles,] containing the history of wars: for the Goths being a warlike people, he

^a Vid. Corderii Caten. Patr. Gr. in Pf. ii. ver. 7. T. i. p. 27. In Pf. viii. ver. 6. p. 158. In Pf. xxix. al. xl. ver. 7. p. 740.

^o Socr. l. ii. c. 41. f. l. iv. c. 33. Soz. l. iv. c. 23. l. vi. c. 37. Theod. l. iv. c. 37. Philost. l. ii. c. 5.

^p Cav. H. L. Tillem. Les Ariens art. 132, 133.

^q Socr. l. ii. c. 41. fin.

^r Vid. Socr. l. iv. c. 33. Soz. l. vi. c. 37.

^s Παλαι γὰρ τὰς τῆς Θεοφωσίας ἀκρίβειας ἀνέμαρτον, τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς ἐνδριφεύουσι δόγματι. Theod. l. iv. c. 37. p. 195. D.

^t Οὐ δὲ νῦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τότε οἱ γότθοι ἀνέμαρτον μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς λέγουσι τὴν ἑνότητα. Phil. l. ii. c. 5.

^u ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἑνὸς ἐκ ἀνιχνύμεθα. κ. λ.

ib. p. 196. B.

^u Τότῃ δὲ καὶ ὑλφίλας, ὁ τῶν γότθων ἐπισκοπὸς, γραμματεῖα ἐφύρα γότθικα, καὶ τὰς θείας γραφὰς εἰς τὴν γότθων μέταβαλὼν, τῆς βαρβαρῆς μάθων τὰ θεία λόγια παρῆσκυασι. Socr. l. iv. c. 33. p. 251.

Πρῶτος δὲ γραμματεῖων ευρείης αὐτοῖς ἐσκεύη, καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν φωνὴν μετέφρασε τὰς ἱερὰς βιβλίας. Soz. l. vi. c. 37. p. 698. A.

^x Καὶ γραμματεῖων αὐτοῖς οἰκίαν ευρείης καλῆς, μετέφρασαν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν φωνὴν τὰς γραφὰς ἀπασας, πλὴν γὰρ τῶν βασιλείων, αἱ τῶν πολεμῶν ἱστορίαι ἐχρῶντο. κ. λ. Phil. l. ii. c. 5.

thought

thought they rather needed a check, than an incentive to fighting.

As these were great performances, I have placed at the bottom of the page, the accounts of several writers in the original words at length.

This may suffice for a brief history of Arian writers, in most of which articles somewhat has offered relating to the scriptures, so much respected by all Christians in general.

C H A P. LXX.

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT, THE FIRST CHRISTIAN EMPEROR.

- I. *The time and place of Constantine's birth, and the condition of his mother Helena.* II. *The state of the Roman empire in the latter part of the third, and the beginning by the fourth Century, with a view of Constantine's reign.* III. *His conversion to the Christian religion.* IV. *His acts, as a Christian, or favourer of Christians:* 1. *Edicts in favour of the Christians, soon after the defeat of Maxentius,* 2. *Particular privileges for catholic Christians, and their ministers.* 3. *Edicts in favour of the Christians, and restraining the heathens, after the final defeat of Licinius.* 4. *The council of Nice.* 5. *Churches built by Constantine and Helena in Palestine.* 6. *Of her finding the cross at Jerusalem.* 7. *Heathen people farther restrained, their temples shut up, and some of them demolished.* 8. *His treatment of heretics.* 9. *His religious exercises, and laws for observing the Lord's day, for abolishing the punishment of the cross, for prohibiting shows of Gladiators, and the like.* 10. *Other laws and edicts.* V. *His character.* VI. *The censures passed upon several of his actions examined.* VII. *Remarks upon the different treatment of catholics, heretics, and heathen people.* VIII. *His testimony to the sacred scriptures.*

I. **CONSTANTINE**, called the ^a great, son of Flavius Valerius Constantius, surnamed Chlorus, and Helena, was born on the 27th day of February, in the year of Christ ^b 272, or, as some think in ^c 273, or, as others, in ^d 274.

^a His name at length, in Latin, is Caius Flavius Valerius Aurelius Claudius Constantinus Magnus.

^b Natus est tertio Calendas Martii A. 272. Anno 306. octavo Cal. Augusti, patre Eboraci mortuo, in Imperatorem levatus est. Cav. H. L. in Constant. M.

Natus est Constantinus anno Ch. 272. ex Helena priori Constantii Chlori conjugē. Pagi Ann. 337. n. iv.

Constantinus — anno vel 272 vel 273 natus est. Basnag. 306. n. iii.

^c Imprimis certum est Constantinum natum esse anno circiter 273, Aureliano imperante. Noris. Diss. de M. Constantini patria & parentibus.

^d Natus Naïsi Daciae oppido A. C. 274, die 27 Februarii. Fabric. B. Gr. l. v. c. 3. § 1.

Il naquit le 27 Fevrier, vers l'an 274. Tillem. L'Emp. Constantin. Art. iv. in.

Baronius,

Baronius*, and many others, have thought, that Constantine was born in Britain. Others† (which I suppose to be at present the more common opinion,) say, he‡ was born at Naissus, now called Nissa, a town of Dardania in Illyricum.

The opinion, that Constantine was born in Britain, is chiefly founded upon a passage in the panegyric of an anonymous author to Maximian and Constantine, spoken in the year 307; where it is said, that§ Constantine had ennobled Britain by his birth. But that expression may be as well understood¶ of his royal, as of his natural birth. Eumenes likewise, in his panegyric to this prince, calls‡ Britain happy, which first saw Constantine Cæsar. But the meaning, I apprehend, is not, that Britain first saw Constantine, but first saw him Cæsar: he having been there proclaimed Cæsar by the soldiers, immediately after his father's death.

It is generally allowed, that Helena, the mother of Constantine, was a woman of a mean birth. And S. Ambrose¹ calls her stabulariam, perhaps, as being the daughter of an innkeeper.

Whether Helena was the lawful wife of Constantius Chlorus, or only his concubine, is a disputable point: for even some‡ Christian, as well as‡ heathen authors, call her a concubine, and her son spurious. It may seem strange, that Constantine should succeed his father in the empire without dispute, when there were several sons by a legal wife, if he was not legitimate. But the writer of the Paschal Chronicle (who calls Constantine

* Ann. 306. n. xvi. † Pagi Crit. in Baron. 306. n. ix. Basnag. 306. n. iii. Cuper. Pr. ad Laët. de M. P. Tillem. Hist. des Emp. T. iv. P. i. Constantin. Art. iv. Noris. Diff. de M. Constantin. patr. & parent. § Hic igitur Constantinus natus Helena matre vilissima in oppido [forte vilissimo in oppido. Cuper.] Naïso, atque educus, quod oppidum postea magnifice ornavit. Excerpta auctoris incerti a Valesio edita, ap. Amm. Marcell. p. 710. Lugd. Bat. 1693. Vid. & Jul. Firmic. Mathes. l. i. c. ult. & Steph. de Urbibus. V. Naïso. h — Libera- vit ille [Constantinus] Britannias servitute: ut etiam nobiles illic oriendo fecisset. Paneg. vi. § 4. p. 192. Paris. 1676.

¶ Vid. Basnag. 306. n. iii. Pagi 306. c. xiv. xv. k O fortunata, & nunc omnibus beator terris Britannia, quæ Constantinum Cæsarem prima vidisset. Paneg.

vii. § ix. p. 207. ¹ Stabulariam hanc primo fuisse asserunt, sic cognitam Constantio Seniori, qui postea regnum adeptus est. Amb. de Obiit. Theod. § 42. p. 1209. T. ii.

‡ Constantius sexto decimo imperii anno diem obiit Eboraci. Post quem filius ejus Constantinus, ex concubina Helena procreatus, regnum invadit. Hieron. Chron. p. 180.

Και ἐδὲξάτο αὐτὸν ὁ παῖς αὐτῆς Κωνσταντίνος, ὁ νεὸς ἐξ Ἑλληνικῆς αὐτῶν γενόμενος· οἱ γὰρ ἀπὸ Θεοδοῦρος αὐτῶν τεχνεὶς μικροὶ ὑπάρχον. Chr. Pasch. p. 278. A. B. Paris. 1688.

‡ Κωνσταντίνος ἐξ ὁμιλίας γυναικὸς ὁ σιμωνῆς, καὶ κατὰ νόμον συνελθούσης Κωνσταντίας τῆς βασιλεῖς γεγεννημένος. Zof. l. ii. p. 672.

Verum Constantio mortuo, Constantinus, ex obscuriore matrimonio ejus filius, in Britannia creatus est imperator. Eutrop. l. x. cap. 2.

(spurious)

spurious) assigns this reason for it, that * all the other children of Constantius were young at the time of his death.

However, beside that undisputed succession, there are several reasons to think, Helena was the lawful wife of Constantius Chlorus. If Constantine had been illegitimate, he would not have been treated, when young, with so much respect by Dioclesian as he was. When it was proposed to choose new Cæsars, it does not appear that any exception was made to Constantine, on account of his birth. The author of a panegyric pronounced in 313, speaks of Constantine, as the genuine son of Constantius: which would scarce have been openly mentioned, if there had been any ground for suspicion or contradiction. And the historians, who speak of Constantius's marriage with the daughter of Maximian, say, he was first divorced from his former wife. All which seem to be arguments of no small force, for the lawful marriage of Helena: and will at least render it probable, that if she was originally a concubine only, she was afterwards married to Constantius.

Cardinal Noris ingeniously accounts for Constantius's marrying a woman of mean condition, from the low military office he was in, when young. And if there is any ground for the story in Nicephorus, one might be apt to think, that Constantius became first acquainted with Helena at Drepanum in Bithynia: which too might be the place of her birth, and, as is well known, was afterwards in honour of her called Helenopolis.

Constantine, as a dutiful son, took care, when emperor, that the highest honours should be given her. By his appointment, she had the titles of Augusta and empress all over the empire, and medals were coined with her head upon them.

* Vid. not. m. *Εὐσεβίου τῶν βασιλέων* καὶ ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ παρῶν καὶ λ. Euseb. V. C. l. i. c. 19.

† Vid. de M. P. cap. 18, 19.

‡ Quod erat ille Maximiani suppositus, fu Constantii Pii filius. Paneg. ix. c. 4.

§ Relicta enim Helena priore uxore, filiam Maximiani Theodorum duxit uxorem. Vales. Anonym. in.

Prior Herculi privignam, alter Diocletiano editam sortiuntur, diremptis prioribus conjugis. Aurel. Vict. de Cæsar. c. 39.

—— Tradens Constantio Theodorum Herculi Maximiani privignam, abjecta uxore priori. Victor. Epit. c. 39.

Ambo uxores, quas habuerunt, repudiare

compulsi. Eutrop. l. ix.

† Caterum Helenam origine plebeiam fuisse, si antiquioribus ulla fides.—Hæc verisimiliora sient, si primam in castris Constantii dignitatem consideremus. Fuit enim primum Protector.—Fieri ergo potuit, ut Constantius cum ex injuncto munere Protectoris itinerum custodiis præset, ac publicorum equorum stabula, quæ amplissima per Romanum imperium publicis impensis servabantur, Helenæ stabularii filia pulchritudine captus, cum eadem nuptias iniverit. Noris. ubi supr. p. 648. * Vid. Niceph. T. i. p. 463, 464. * Euseb. de V. C. l. iii. c. 47. Vid. & c. 43.

From Christian writers she^y has the character of a discreet, pious, and devout woman.

It has been however insinuated by some to her disadvantage, that^a she was the occasion of Constantine's neglecting for a long time his brothers, sons of his father Constantius by Theodora. And indeed soon after her death, they or their children had signal testimonies of regard from Constantine. Nevertheless, it has been thought, that it had been better for him to have followed the prudent directions of his mother: for their preferments in the issue proved fatal to them. Valesius^a makes no scruple to commend that part of her conduct.

Helena lived to a great^b age: she is supposed by some, to have died^c in the year 326. Fabricius, in his Chronology of the Life of Constantine, placeth her death^d in 327, as does Valesius^e. Tillemont computes, that^f she died in 327, or 328.

By Eusebius we are informed, that^g she was buried at Rome; where she died too, as some think. Others say, she did not die there, because Eusebius's account is, that she was conveyed thither with great funeral pomp. It is however allowed, that her death happened at no great distance from^h Rome.

II. It will be of use, before we proceed any farther in the history of Constantine, to take a general survey of the state of the Roman empire about this time.

Dioclesian, aⁱ man of a mean original, born at Dioclea, an obscure town in Dalmatia, having signalized himself by his valour and conduct, was proclaimed emperor, on the 17th day of September, in the year 284. On the first of April, in 286, Maximian, called Herculus, born near Sirmium in Pannonia, who had been Cæsar some time before, was^k declared Augustus, and joint emperor with Dioclesian. This^l was done at a place near Nicomedia, the capital city of Bithynia.

On the first of March 292, Constantius Chlorus and Galerius Maximian^m were created Cæsars, by the two fore-men-

ⁱ — Διοκλητῆς βασιλεὺς Διοφίλης μητρὸς — βασιλεὺς Διοσιβέριαν. Euf. de V. C. l. iii. c. 43. & passim. — υπερβαλλέουσα ἑραυρεται. — ib. c. 42. — τὴν Δαυμασίαν. — c. 45.

^z See Tillemont Saint Helene Art. i. & Constantin. Art. 85.

^a Annot. ad Euf. de V. C. l. iii. c. 42.

^b Euf. ib. c. 42. & 56.

^c Vid. Pagi 326. n. xiv. xv. Bafnag. 326. n. xi.

^d Lux Evangelii, p. 270.

^e Vid. Ann. ad Euf. de V. C. l. iii. c. 47.

^f See him in Constantin. Art. 63. &

Helene Art. 7.

^g Πλεῖστη γὰρ δоруφο-
ρια ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλευσαν πόλιν ἀνεκομιζέτο.
De V. C. c. 47.

^h See Tillemont in
St. Helene Art. viii. & Bafnag. An. 326,
n. xi.

ⁱ Vid. Pagi in Baron, 284,
n. iv. Bafnag. Ann. 284. n. ii.

^k Pagi 286. n. ii. Bafn. 286. n. i.

^l Erat locus altus extra civitatem ad mil-
lia fere tria, in cujus summo Maximianus
ipse purpuram sumserat. De Mort. Perf.
c. 19.

^m Pagi 292. n. ii. Bafn,
292. n. i. ii.

tioned emperors. And the better to secure the fidelity of the Cæsars, new marriages were concluded for ^a them. Constantius dismissing Helena, mother of Constantine, married Theodora, daughter-in-law of Maximian Herculus. And Galerius Maximian married Valeria, daughter of Dioclesian.

Constantius, the first of the two Cæsars, was a man of a good family. His ^o father, Eutropius, was a nobleman of Dardania: His mother Claudia, was daughter of a brother of the emperor Claudius the second.

Constantius is highly commended by ^p Eusebius, and has a good character likewise from ^q heathen authors. By Claudia Theodora, whom he now married, he had ^r six children, three sons, and as many daughters. Their names are ^s generally reckoned to be these: Julius Constantius, Dalmatius, Anibalius, Constantia, Eutropia, Anastasia.

Galerius Maximian, the other Cæsar, was surnamed ^t Armentarius, because his father was a grazier, or he himself had been so. He ^u was born in Dacia near Sardica.

Now the empire was divided betwixt those ^x four. Constantius, as Cæsar, had to his share Britain and Gaul.

^a Atque ut eos etiam affinitate jungeret, Constantius privignam Herculi Theodoram accepit, ex qua postea sex Liberos Constantini fratres habuit. Galerius filiam Diocletiani Valeriam. Ambo uxores, quas habuerunt, repudiare compulsi. Eutrop. l. ix. c. 22.

His de causis Julium Constantium, Galerium Maximianum, cui cognomen Armentario erat, creatos Cæsares, in affinitatem vocant. Prior Herculi privignam, alter Diocletiano editam sortiuntur, diremtis prioribus conjugii. S. Aur. Victor. de Cæsarib. c. 39.

Is Maximianum Augustum effecit. Constantium & Galerium Maximianum cognomento Armentarium, Cæsares creavit, tradens Constantio Theodoram Herculi Maximiani privignam, abjecta uxore priori. Victor. Epit. c. 39.

Iste cum Galerio a Diocletiano Cæsar factus est. Relicta enim Helena priore uxore, filiam Maximiani Theodoram duxit uxorem. Anon. Valef. p. 710.

^o Claudius, Quintilius, & Crispus, fratres fuerunt. Crispi filia, Claudia. Ex ea & Eutropio, nobilissimo gentis Dardanzæ viro, Constantius Cæsar est genitus. Trebell. Poll. in Claudio n. 13.

Diocletianus Maximianum Herculum ex Cæsare fecit Augustum, Constantium & Maximianum Cæsares, quorum Con-

stantius per filiam nepos Claudii traditur, Eutrop. l. ix. c. 22.

Constantius Divi Claudii optimi principis nepos ex fratre. Anon. Valef. p. 710.

^p H. E. l. viii. c. 13. p. 309. B. C. p. 317. C. D. De Vit. Const. l. i. c. 13, 14.

^q Vir egregius, & præstantissimæ civitatis, &c. Eutrop. Brev. l. x. c. 1.

^r Ex qua postea sex liberos Constantini fratres habuit. Euseb. Chron. p. 178. Vid. & Eutrop. l. ix. c. 22. & Anon. Valef. p. 710.

^s Vid. Basnag. Ann. 306. n. 2. Tillem. Const. Art. iii. Hist. T. iv. p. 130.

^t Igitur Constantio, Armentarioque, his succedentibus.—Aurel. Vict. c. 40. in Cæs.

Galerius autem fuit (licet inculta aggressi- que justitia,) satis laudabilis—ortus parentibus agrariis, pastor armentorum: unde ei cognomen Armentarius fuit. Vict. Epit. cap. 40.

^u Maximianus Galerius in Dacia haud longe a Sardica natus. Eutrop. l. ix. c. 22.

Ortus Dacia Ripensi, ibique sepultus est. Vict. Epit. c. 39.

^x Quasi partito imperio, cuncta quæ trans Alpes Galliz sunt, Constantio commissa: Africa, Italiaque Herculo: Illyricique ora ad usque Ponti fretum, Galerio: Cætera Valerius retentavit. Aurel. Vict. Cæs. c. 39.

Under

Under these emperors, and their two Cæsars, began what is called Dioclesian's persecution; which lasted ten years, or more, in some parts of the empire, before it was universally extinguished.

There had been a persecution some time ⁷ before, in the ² court and the army, but it became general in the year 303. For on ^a the 23d day of February in that year, the church of the Christians ^b at Nicomedia in Bithynia was demolished, Dioclesian and Galerius being then both in that city. On the next day, February 24th, the ^c edict against the Christians was published. According to the writer of ^d the book Of the Deaths of Persecutors, and ^e Eusebius, Galerius was the chief author of this persecution. When the edict had been published at Nicomedia, it ^f was sent to Herculus and Constantius, to be put in execution by them in those parts of the empire which were particularly under their care. Maximian Herculus, in Italy, readily ^g complied: but Constantius, though he did not dare openly to oppose his colleagues, moderated ^h the persecution within the extent of his government.

In the year 305, Dioclesian and Maximian resigned the empire, both on the same day, being ⁱ the first of May; the former at a place near Nicomedia, the latter at ^k Milan. At the same time Constantius Chlorus and Galerius Maximian were

⁷ Vid. Pagi An. 298. n. 2. ² Tunc ira furens sacrificare non eos tantum qui sacris ministrabant, sed universos qui erant in palatio iussit: & in eos, qui detraxissent, verberibus animadverti, datisque ad præpositos literis, etiam milites cogi ad nefanda sacrificia præcepit, ut qui non paruissent, militia solverentur. Hactenus furor ejus & ira processit, nec amplius quiequam contra legem aut religionem Dei fecit. De M. P. c. 10.

^a Vid. Pagi. 302. n. iii. v. Basnag. 303. n. v.

^b Terminalia deliguntur, quæ sunt ad septimum kalendas Martias.—Qui dies cum illuxisset, —ad ecclesiam profectus cum ducibus & tribunis & rationalibus venit. —Veniebant igitur prætoriani, acie structa, cum securibus. —& immissi undique, tamen illud editissimum paucis horis solo adæquatur. De M. P. c. 12.

^c Postridie propositum est edictum, quo cavebatur, ut religionis illius homines carerent omni honore ac dignitate, tormentis subiecti essent. — ib. c. 13. in.

^d Cap. 10, 11, 12.

^e H. E. l. viii. c. 16. p. 314. D.

^f Et jam literæ ad Maximianum atque Constantium commoverant, ut eadem fa-

cerent. Eorum sententia in tantis rebus expectata non erat. D. M. P. c. 15.

^g Et quidem senex Maximianus libens per Italiam paruit, homo non adeo clemens. Id. ib.

^h Nam Constantius, ne dissentire a majorum præceptis videretur, conventicula, id est, parietes, qui restitui poterant, dirui passus est: verum autem Dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incolume servavit. D. M. P. c. 15.

Vexabatur ergo universa terra, & præter Gallias, ab oriente usque ad occasum tres acerbissimæ bestię sæviebant. Id. c. 16. Vid. & Euf. H. E. l. viii. c. 13. p. 309. D. & p. 317. D. Vit. Const. l. i. c. 13. p. 413. D. & cap. 16. & 17.

ⁱ Cum hæc essent constituta, proceditur kalendis Maiis. De M. P. c. 19. in.

^k Uterque una die privato habitu imperii insigne mutavit: Nicomedie Diocletianus, Herculus Mediolani. — Concesserunt autem Salonas unus, alter in Lucaniam. Diocletianus privatus in villa, quæ haud procul a Salonis est, præclaro otio senuit. Eutrop. l. ix. c. 27, 28. Vid. & Victor. Epit. cap. 39.

declared

declared Augusti and emperors, and ¹ Maximin and Severus Cæsars. Dioclesian after this spent the remainder of his days near Salonæ in Dalmatia, and died in 313. Maximian Herculius retired for the present to that part of Italy which was called Lucania.

Maximin and Severus were both ^m of Illyricum. The former, whose ⁿ original name was Daia, or Daza, was ^o son of a sister of Galerius, and ^p only a grazier, or feeder of cattle, as the rest of the family were. The ^q family of Severus is unknown.

The empire ^r was then divided between Constantius and Galerius, and their Cæsars. Constantius had for his part Italy, Gaul, Britain, Africa, and the other provinces of the western part of the empire; Galerius had Illyricum, Thrace, Asia, the East, with Egypt. Constantius soon quitted Italy, and the other provinces belonging to him, and gave ^s them to Severus, contenting himself with Gaul and Britain. Galerius ^t too, kept only Illyricum, Thrace, and Asia; yielding to Maximin the East, that is, Syria, and the provinces depending upon it, together with Egypt.

It was expected by many, that ^u at the resignation of Dioclesian, Constantine should have been declared Cæsar; but he was passed by for the sake of those just mentioned, and ^v was kept by Galerius, as an hostage for the fidelity of Constantius, as he had been before by Dioclesian. However, it was not

¹ Tunc repente pronuntiat Severum & Maximinum Cæsares. De M. P. c. 19.

^m Igitur Constantio Armentarioque his succedentibus, Severus Maximinusque Illyricorum indigenæ Cæsares. Aur. Viâ. c. 40. in Cæs.

ⁿ Hunc, inquit, ostendens Daiam adolescentem quendam semibarbarum, quem recens jusserrat Maximinum vocari de suo nomine. De M. P. c. 18.

^o Galerius Maximinus sorore Armentarii progenitus, veroque nomine ante imperium Daza dictus, Cæsar quadriennio, dehinc per Orientem Augustus triennio fuit: ortu quidem atque instituto pastoralis, &c. Viâ. Epit. c. 40.

^p Daia vero sublatus nuper a pecoribus & silvis, statim scutarius, continuo protector, mox tribunus, postmodum Cæsar, accepit Orientem calcandum & conterendum. &c. De M. P. c. 10.

^q Severus filium habuit Severianum, ubi constat ex cap. 50. Nomen uxoris & parentum incognitum. Cuperus in not. ad libr. de M. P. c. 39. p. 219. Ultraj. 1693.

^r His igitur abe-

untibus, ad administrationem reipublicæ, Constantius & Galerius Augusti creati sunt, divisusque inter eos Romanus orbis, ut Galliam, Italiam, Africam Constantius: Illyricum, Asiam, Orientem Galerius obtineret, sumtis duobus Cæsaribus. Eutrop. l. x. init. Vid. & Euf. H. E. l. viii. c. 13. p. 309. B.

^s Constantius tamen, contentus dignitate Augusti Italix atque Africæ administrandæ sollicitudinem recusavit. Eutrop. l. x. c. 1.

^t Interea Cæsares duo facti, Severus & Maximinus. Maximino datum est Orientis imperium. Galerius sibi Illyricum, Thraciam & Bithyniam tenuit. Severus suscepit Italiam, & quicquid Herculius obtinebat. Anon. Valef. p. 711.

His diebus Constantius Constantini pater, atque Armentarius, Cæsares, Augusti appellantur; creatis Cæsaribus Severo per Italiam, Maximino Galerii sororis filio per Orientem. Viâ. Epit. c. 40. Vid. & Zol. l. ii. p. 672.

^u Vid. de M. P. c. 19. ^v Hic igitur Constantinus, — obles apud

very

very long after this, before Constantine obtained leave of Galerius to depart: which he did immediately, and though not without difficulty, yet by ^r great diligence and prudent circumspection, he got safe to his father Constantius: with whom he was, when he died at York in (A) Britain, July 25, 306.

Constantius upon his death-bed appointed his son Constantine his heir and successor, with the style and ^a titles, as it seems, of emperor and Augustus. And immediately upon the death of his father, Constantine was so proclaimed ^a by the soldiers in Britain, in ^b the fourth year of the persecution. But Galerius Maximian would allow him no higher title than that of Cæsar, which ^c Constantine accepted for the present.

On the 27th ^d of October, 306, Maxentius ^e, son of Maximian Hercules, who had also married a daughter of Galerius, assumed the title of Augustus at Rome. And being sensible, that this would displease Galerius, he sends for his father Maximian Hercules, who ^f thereupon resumed the purple.

Diocletianum & Galerium, sub iisdem fortiter in Asia militavit. Anon. Valef. p. 710.

Nam is a Galerio, religionis specie, ad vicem obfidiis tenebatur. Aur. Viſt. c. 40.

^r Vid. de M. P. c. 24. Anonym. Valef. p. 710, 711. Aur. Viſt. c. 40. Viſt. Epit. c. 41. Zofim. l. ii. p. 672. Euseb. V. Conſt. l. i. c. 20, 21.

(A) It is commonly said by learned moderns, that when Constantine came to York, he found his father dying. And they have for it the authority of the writer De M. Persec. c. 24. pervenit ad patrem jam deficientem, & also Euseb. de V. C. l. i. c. 21. & Zof. l. ii. c. 572. and Aurel. Viſt. Epit. Et forte iisdem diebus ibidem Constantium parentem fata ultima perurgebant. But Tillemont in Constantin, art. vii. p. 144. says, that this is not exact. For Eumenes in the presence of Constantine, before the war with Maxentius, and probably in 309, says, that Constantine came to his father, when he was weighing anchor for Britain. Cum ad tempus ipsum, quo pater in Britanniam transfretabat, classi jam vela facienti repentinus tuus adventus illuxit. Paneg. viii. § 7. And the Anonymous author, published by Valesius, says, that Constantine found his father at Bologne: and speaks of a victory, which Constantius obtained afterwards over the Picts. Ad patrem Constantium venit apud Bononiam. — Post victoriam autem Pictorum Constantius pater Eboraci mortuus est. Excerpt. p. 711.

^z Vid. Bafn. 306. n.

2. Pagi 306. n. 7. Tillem. Constantin. Art. vii. T. iv. p. 145.

^a Pervenit ad patrem jam deficientem, qui ei militibus commendato imperium per manus tradidit, &c. De M. P. c. 24. Vid. & Euf. H. E. l. viii. c. 13. p. 309. C. V. Conſt. l. i. c. 21. Valef. Anonym. p. 711. Socrat. l. i. c. 2. in.

^b Quarto persecutionis anno Constantinus regnare orſus. Euf. Chr. p. 180.

^c Cujus tanta maturitas est, ut cum tibi pater imperium reliquisset, Cæſaris tamen appellatione contentus, expectare malueris, ut idem te, qui illum declararet Augustum. Incerti Paneg. ad Maximian. & Constantin. cap. 5.

^d Imminuebat dies, quo Maxentius imperium ceperat, qui est ad sextum kalendas Novembris. De M. P. cap. 44.

^e Erat autem Maximiano [filius] Maxentius, hujus Maximiani gener, — adeo superbus & contumax, ut neque patrem, neque socerum, solitus sit adorare. Et iccirco utrique invisus fuit. De M. P. c. 18.

Genuit ex Eutropia Syra muliere Maxentium & Faustam conjugem Constantini: cujus patri Constantio tradiderat Theodoram privignam, &c. Viſt. Epit. c. 40.

^f Patri suo post depositum imperium in Campania moranti purpuram mittit, & bis Augustum nominat. Ille vero & rerum novarum cupidus, & qui deposuerat invitus, libenter arripuit. De M. P. c. 26.

Romæ interea Prætoriani, excitato tumultu Maxentium Herculi filium, qui haud procul ab urbe in villa publica morabatur, Augustum nuncupaverunt: quo nun-

And in this year, or the ² beginning of the year following, 307, Severus, who, as Cæsar, had to his share Italy and Africa, was overcome ^h, and put to death.

Maximian and his son Maxentius did not long agree together: Maximian ^l therefore, the better to strengthen his interest, and carry on his own views, goes to Constantine in Gaul: and some time in this year ^k, 307, gives him in marriage ^l his daughter Fausta, Minervina the former wife or concubine of Constantine, by whom he had ^m his eldest son Crispus, being dead, as is supposed. And now, as ⁿ it seems, Constantine receives the title of Augustus from Maximian.

About this time Galerius ^o makes Licinius, his old acquaintance, and a man of mean extraction, Augustus. And now there were in ^p effect six emperors; Maximian, who, as we said before, had resumed the purple, Galerius, Constantine, Maximin, Maxentius, and Licinius.

Maximian, after a base and unsteady conduct, was ^q condemned, and put to death by Constantine's order in 310. Galerius died ^r in 311, of a long ^s and grievous distemper, sup-

cio Maximianus Hercules ad spem erectus resumendi fastigii, quod invitus amiserat, Romam advolavit a Lucania. &c. Eutrop. l. x. c. ii. Vid. & Zof. l. ii. p. 673. Anon. Valef. p. 711.

² Vid. Pagi. 307. n. 5. Baluz. not. ad libr. de M. P. c. 27. p. 66.

^h Ausæ Maxentio opes, confirmatumque imperium. Severus fugiens Ravennæ interfecit. Eutrop. l. x. c. 3. Vid. Zof. l. ii. p. 673. Aur. Viâ. c. 40. Viâ. Epit. c. 40.

^l Hercules tamen Maximianus, post hæc in concione exercitus filium Maxentium denudare conatus, seditionem & convicia militum tulit. Inde ad Gallias profectus est dolo composito, tanquam a filio esset expulsus, ut Constantino genero jungeretur. Eutrop. l. x. c. 3.

^k Vid. Baluz. ad libr. de M. P. c. 27. p. 66.

^l — proficiscitur in Galliam, ut Constantinum partibus suis conciliaret suæ minoris filię nuptiis. De M. P. c. 27. Vid. & Zof. l. ii. p. 673, 674.

^m Filiumque suum Crispum nomine, ex Minervina concubina susceptum. Viâ. Epit. cap. 41. Κωνσταντίνος μεν πατρίσιν Καίσαρα Κρίσπον, εκ παλλακῆς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν Μισσερείνης ονομα. Zof. l. ii. p. 679. Vid. & Basn. Ann. 326. n. i.

ⁿ Et tibi, Constantine, per focerum nomen imperatoris accreverit. Incerti Paneg. Maxim. & Const. cap. 2. Vid. & cap. 5. & Basn. Ann. 307. n. 3.

^o Aderat

ibi Diocles a genero nuper accitus, ut, quod ante non fecerat, præsentem illo imperium Licinio daret, substituto in Severi loco. De M. P. c. 29.

Per hoc tempus Licinius a Galerio imperator est factus, Dacia oriundus, notus ei ex antiqua consuetudine, & in bello, quod adversus Narseum gesserat, strenuit laboribus & officiis acceptus. Eutrop. l. x. c. 4.

Licinius itaque ex nova Dacia vilioris originis a Galerio factus imperator, velut adversum Maxentium pugnaturus. Anon. Valef. p. 713. Vid. & Euf. H. E. l. viii. c. 13. p. 310. A. Aur. Viâ. c. 40. Viâ. Epit. c. 40. Zof. l. ii. p. 674.

^p Sic uno tempore sex fuerunt. De M. P. 29.

^q Moliens tamen Constantinum, reperta occasione, interficere, qui in Galliis, & militum & provincialium favore regnabat. — Detectis igitur insidiis per Faustam filiam, quæ dolum viro enuntiaverat, profugit Hercules Massiliam, ibique oppressus. Eutrop. l. x. c. 3. Vid. & de M. P. c. 29, 30. Euf. H. E. l. viii. c. 13. p. 310. A. B. De V. C. l. i. c. 57. Zof. l. ii. p. 674. Viâ. Epit. c. 40.

^r Vid. Pagi. 311. n. 14, 15.

^s Jam decimus & octavus annus agitur, cum percussit eum Deus insanabili plaga. Nascitur ei ulcus malum in inferiori parte genitalium, serpitque latius, &c. De M. P. c. 33, 34. Vid. & Euf. H. E. l. viii. c. 16, 17.

posed

posed to be inflicted on him as a judgment from heaven, for his inhuman cruelty to the Christians. Maxentius was overcome by Constantine, and drowned in the river Tiber, ^a on the 27th of October, in 312. Maximin died in 313: the manner of his death is particularly described ^b in the book Of the Deaths of Persecutors, and ^c in Eusebius. I may just add here, though it was mentioned before, that Dioclesian also died ^d in the year 313.

But before the death of Maximin, in the same year, 313, Constantine ^e married his sister Constantia to Licinius. And as from that time their interests were united, so upon the death of Maximin, the whole empire was in their power, and divided between them.

But their friendship did not long subsist without ^f interruption. For in the year ^g 314, the animosity between them broke out into an open war; and two battles were fought, the first at Cibalis in Pannonia, the second in Campo Martiense, which place is not certainly (B) known: immediately after which, peace was concluded, and a new partition made of the empire.

Pauloque post vulnere pestilenti consumtus est. Aur. Vict. c. 40.

Galerius Maximianus consumtis genitalibus defecit. Vict. Epit. c. 40.

Tunc Galerius in Illyrico Licinium Cæsarem fecit. Deinde illo in Pannonia relicto, ipse ad Serdiciam regressus, morbo ingenti occupatus sic dissiabit, ut aperto & putrescente viscere moreretur, in supplicium persecutionis iniquissimæ ad auctorem scelerati præcepti iustissima pœna redeunte. Anon. Valef. p. 712.

ⁱ Ipse in fugam versus properat ad pontem, qui interruptus erat, ac multitudine fugientium pressus in Tiberim deturbatur. De M. P. c. 44.

Ipsum postremo adversus nobiles omnibus exitiis sævientem, apud pontem Milvium vicit, Italiaque potitus est. Eutrop. l. x. c. 4. Vid. Vict. Epit. c. 40. Incerti Paneg. Constant. Aug. c. 17. Euf. H. E. l. ix. c. 9. p. 358. D. 359. A.

^j Angore animi ac metu confugit ad mortem, quasi ad remedium malorum, quæ Deus in caput ejus ingessit. — Et sic hausit venenum. &c. De M. P. c. 49.

^k Euf. H. E. l. ix. c. 9. p. 365, 366. De V. C. l. i. c. 58, 59.

^l Vid. hbr. de M. P. c. 42, 43. Pagi A. 316. n. 3, 4, 5. Bafn. An. 313. n. 2.

^m Constantinus, rebus in Urbe compositis, hyeme proxima Mediolanum contendit. Eodem Licinius advenit, ut acciperet uxorem. De M. P. c. 45.

Sed oppresso Maxentio, cum recepisset Italiam Constantinus, hoc Licinius fœdere sibi fecit adjungi, ut Licinius Constantiam sororem Constantini apud Mediolanum duxisset uxorem. Anon. Valef. p. 713. Vid. & Eutrop. l. x. c. 5. Vict. Epit. c. 41. Euf. H. E. l. x. c. 8. p. 395. B. V. Const. l. i. c. 50.

ⁿ Ita potestas Orbis Romani duobus quæsita: qui quamvis per Flavii sororem nuptam Licinio connexi inter se erant, ob diversos mores tamen anxie triennium congruere quivere. Aur. Vict. c. 41.

^o Vid. Pagi 517. n. 4, 5, 6. Bafn. 214. n. 1, 2, 3, 4.

(B) My learned friend, Mr. Ward, Professor of Rhetoric at Gresham College, has favoured me with this conjecture: 'May it not be Margensi? Pliny mentions the river Margis in Mæsia, which joins to Pannonia. Lib. iii. cap. 26. And in the Notitia Im. Rom. we have in the same country, Auxilium Margense Margo. Where Margum is the name of a town. Sect. 30. Ed. Labbe. This situation seems to suit the former battle.'

A second war between them began ^c in 323, which was concluded in 324, with the intire defeat of Licinius, who was reduced to a private condition. Others ^d place that total defeat of Licinius in the year 323: and though his life was then given him at the intercession of Constantia, he was ^e put to death in the year 324, or 325.

This was the end of those civil wars in the empire, and Constantine now became sole emperor both of the East and West. And having reigned above thirty years from the death of his father Constantius, he died on the day of Pentecost, May 22, 337.

III. Having given this general account of the state of the Roman empire, in the latter part of the third, and beginning of the fourth century, and of the reign of Constantine, the first emperor of Rome who made an open profession of the Christian religion; it is fit, we should now distinctly observe some parts of his history.

His conversion is a remarkable period in his life, as well as an important event, in which the Christians were greatly concerned. The time, occasion, and reasons of it, deserve our consideration.

One might have been apt to think, that Constantine should have received some impressions in favour of the Christian religion, in the early part of his life; for his father Constantius, is said from the beginning of the persecution to have treated the Christians with mildness, in that part of the empire which was under him. And Eusebius says, that ^f Constantius was a worshipper of the one true God, and had in his palace Christian ministers. It might be also conjectured, that Helena, mother of Constantine, had trained up her son in the principles of the Christian religion. And it must be owned, that ^h Theodoret in one place seems to say (c) as much. But yet, I think, it cannot but be more reasonable for us, to rely rather upon Eusebius; who expressly makes it one of the commen-

^c Vid. Pagi 318. n. 2, 3, 5—8. Bafn. 324. n. 1. 325. n. 2, 3.

^d See Tillemont in Constantin, Art. 48, 49, 50. and Note 43, 44.

^e Varia deinceps inter eos bella, & pax reconciliata rupta est. Postremo Licinius navali & terrestri prælio victus apud Nicomediam se dedit, & contra religionem sacramenti Theſſalonicæ privatus occisus. Eutrop. l. x. c. 6.

^f Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. A. D. 244. n. iv.—vii. & 247. n. vi.—x.

^h ——— μόνον μὲν Θεὸν τοῦ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ὄντος

ἔκτος, κ. λ. V. C. l. i. c. 17. p. 416. C. Vid. & c. 27. p. 421. C.

^h ——— τὸν μὲν τὸν φῶς τε καὶ τὴν τῆς εὐσεβείας αὐτῆς προσκείμενα τροφήν. Thdr. H. E. l. i. c. 18. p. 47. D.

(c) Possibly Theodoret means no more, than that Helena nourished and cherished her son's faith by her devout exercises and pious example. So this place may be reconciled with another, where he speaks of Constantine's conversion, as the work of heaven itself. l. i. c. 2. p. 6. B.

dations of Constantine, that ¹ he taught his mother the true religion, who before was ignorant of it.

In order to judge rightly of this matter, it may be best for us to take Eusebius's account at large; who makes Constantine to have chosen the God whom he should worship, when he was undertaking the war with Maxentius, or however before he had finished it: which war ^{*} began in 311, when Constantine was a good deal above thirty years of age.

The title of the 27th chapter of the first book of Eusebius's Life of Constantine is thus: 'That Constantine, weighing in his mind the misfortunes of those who had worshipped idols, made choice of the Christian religion.' 'Considering with himself,' (says the historian) 'that he wanted some better assistance than military forces,—he sought for a God that might be his helper.—He considered therefore with himself, what God he should take to be his helper. Whilst he was deliberating about that matter, this thought came into his mind: that all who before him had arrived at empire, and had placed their hopes in a multitude of gods, and worshipped them with sacrifices and offerings, had been at first deluded by flattering speeches composed to please them, and by oracles that promised them success and prosperity, and afterwards met with an unfortunate end: nor were any of their gods able to deliver them from the calamities inflicted on them by the divine hand: that his father alone, who had taken a course contrary to theirs, and had condemned their error, and ¹ worshipped in the whole of his life the one supreme God, had experienced him to be the saviour and protector of his empire, and the author of all good.—Having well considered these things, he was convinced, that it was the utmost folly to trifle so far, as to pay honour to such gods as were nothing at all. He therefore determined to worship only the God of his father.'

Eusebius proceeds in the following chapter: 'He therefore called upon this God in his prayers, earnestly intreating and beseeching him, that he would make himself known to him, and afford him his powerful aid in the difficult affairs before him. Whilst the emperor was putting up these earnest prayers and supplications, a ^m divine sign of a most won-

¹ Οὕτω μὲν αὐτὴν θεοσεβὴ καὶ ἀγαθὴν αἶψα, καὶ ἡσυχίαν προέβλεπον. κ. λ. V. C. l. iii. c. 47. p. 506. D.

^{*} Quinto tamen Constantinus imperii sui anno bellum adversum Maxentium civile commovit. Eutrop. l. ii. c. 4.

κεῖνα τῶν ὅλων Θεὸν διὰ πάσης τιμῆς αἶψα, σωτὴρα καὶ φυλάκα τῆς βασιλείας, αἰσάμεν τι πάντες χορηγοὶ εὐρισθῶσι. p. 421. C.

^m — Διόσημα τις ἐπιφανὴς νῆλαι παραδοξολάγη. p. 422. A.

¹ — αὐτὸν δὲ τοῦ ἐπι-

derful nature appeared : which thing, possibly, if related by another, would not be easily credited. But the victorious emperor himself having told it to us, who write this history a long time after, when we had the honour of his acquaintance and conversation, and ⁿ having likewise confirmed it with an oath, who can refuse his assent to it ; especially when following events have borne testimony to the truth of it ? He said then, that about noon, when the day was declining, he saw with his own eyes in the heavens, the trophy of the cross, placed above the sun, consisting of light, with an inscription annexed, **BY THIS CONQUER** : that at the sight of it, astonishment seized him and his whole army, which then followed him in a certain march, and beheld that wonderful sight.

In ^o the mean time, as he said, he began to doubt with himself, what the meaning of this should be : but whilst he was revolving it in his mind, and continued meditating upon it, at length night came on. As he slept, the Christ of God appeared to him with that sign which had appeared in the heavens ; and commanded him to make a standard resembling the sign, which he had seen in the heavens, and to use it, as a defence in the battle with his enemies.

As ^p soon as it was day, he arose, and communicated this wonderful thing to his friends. And then sending for such as worked in gold and precious stones, he seated himself in the midst of them, and gave them a description of the sign, and commanded them to make one like it in gold and precious stones ; which also we have seen.

The ^q standard is presently afterwards described by Eusebius, who thereupon proceeds again.

Being ^r then deeply affected with that wonderful sight, and resolving to worship no other God but him that had appeared to him ; he sent for some of those that were acquainted with the mysteries of his doctrine, and asked them, who that God was, and what was the meaning of the sign he had seen. They told him, that he was God, the only begotten Son of the one and only God : that the sign which had appeared to him was the symbol of immortality, and the trophy of the

ⁿ — ομοίως τε πιστώσαμεν τον λογον, τις αν αμφιβαλοι μη εχει πιστευσαι τον διηγη-
ματι ; — αμφι μεσημεριας ηλιω υρας,
ηδη της ημερας αποκλινουσης, αυτοις οφθαλ-
μοις ιδων εφη εν αυτω υραν υπερκειμενον τε
ηλιω καιρω τροπαιον, εκ ουτος συνεσταμεν,
γραφην τε αυτω συνεφθαι, λεγουσαν, τυς νικα*

δαμβος δ' επι του διαματι κρατησαι αυτον
τε και το εργασιον αποται, ο δη γελλομεν
σοι πορειαν συνεπλεο τε και διαρον ισχυο
δανμαλος. De V. C. l. i. c. 28. p. 422.

* lb. c. 29.

q C. 31.

* lb. c. 30.

r C. 32.

* victory

‘ victory obtained by him over death, when he was on earth.
 ‘ They informed him likewise of the causes of his advent, and
 ‘ gave him accurate instructions concerning his incarnation.
 ‘ In such discourses as these was he taught : but he was taken
 ‘ up with the divine appearance that had been afforded him ;
 ‘ and comparing the heavenly vision with the interpretation
 ‘ given of it, he was strengthened in mind ; being ‘ fully satisf-
 ‘ fied, that the knowledge of these matters had been given by
 ‘ God himself. From that time he resolved to give himself to
 ‘ the reading of the divine scriptures. And taking those priests
 ‘ of God for his counsellors, he was persuaded, that the God
 ‘ he had seen was carefully to be worshipped. Thus filled
 ‘ with good hopes, he undertook to extinguish the flames of
 ‘ tyranny.’

This is the account left us by Eusebius, who had it from Constantine himself. And hence it is apparent, I think, that Constantine’s conversion, if he is to be credited, was not the work of men, or of any Christian ministers, but of God himself, together with the reflections he made in his own mind upon past events. And so Theodoret, agreeably enough to this account in Eusebius, says, ‘ that ‘ Constantine was called, ‘ not of men, nor by men, but from heaven, as the divine ‘ apostle Paul was.’

We must, however, make here some remarks, particularly upon the appearance of the luminous cross in the heavens. For it is quite denied by some, who call it “ a fiction, a stratagem,

‘ — διδιδαντες αυτω την τελειν γνωσιν παρειναι παθομενος. ib. p. 424. A. B.

‘ Ος εκ απ ανθρωπων, εδη δι ανθρωπων, αλλ’ εργαθει, καλα τον θεον αποδεχων, της ελπεως ταυτης εινυχε. Thdrt. H. E. l. i. c. 2. p. 6. B.

“ Stratagema hoc Constantini non minus scitum, quam illud Philippi Macedonis, quo sacrilegus Phocenses protrivit. Jacob Tollius in not. ad c. 44. libr. de M. P. p. 267. Traj. ad Rhen. 1693. Vid. & ejusd. not. ad c. 46. p. 278, 279.

Mais moy, — trouvant, que le Roi Antigonus, successeur d’ Alexandre le Grand, s’ est servi du même stratagème, seignant d’ avoir veu au ciel une pentagone, qui est le symbole du salut, avec ces paroles, ‘ in ‘ hoc signo vinces,’ & qu’il le fit peindre aux boucliers de ses soldats, & gagna ainsi la bataille : trouvant aussi, qu’un Roi de Portugal a eu la même vision que Constan- tin, & qu’ il a par là remporté la victoire

sur ses ennemis, j’ avoue, qui je considere tous ces miracles comme des fausses militaires des grands capitaines. On trouvera dans tous les siècles une infinité de ces inventions. Preface du même à Longin du Sublime.

Johannes Hoornbeek professor Leyden- sis in Examine Bullæ Urbani VIII. de cultu imaginum edito anno 1653, a pagina 181, somnium merum ac fabulam putat Constantini visionem crucis in aëre. H. Norisii Opp. T. iv. p. 661.

Audax enimvero nimium fuit Jacobus Oisellius, qui in Thesauo Numismatum antiquorum pag. 463, ait, eum qui totum hoc negotium de cruce offensa Constantino ad pias veterum fraudes retulerit, parum a rei veritate aberraturum. Baluz. Annot. ad c. 44. libr. de M. P.

Et vid. omnino C. A. Heummanni Poec. Tom. ii. p. 50, &c. De Cruce Celesti a Constantino M. conspecta.

derful nature appeared : which thing, possibly, if related by another, would not be easily credited. But the victorious emperor himself having told it to us, who write this history a long time after, when we had the honour of his acquaintance and conversation, and ⁿ having likewise confirmed it with an oath, who can refuse his assent to it; especially when following events have borne testimony to the truth of it? He said then, that about noon, when the day was declining, he saw with his own eyes in the heavens, the trophy of the cross, placed above the sun, consisting of light, with an inscription annexed, **BY THIS CONQUER**: that at the sight of it, astonishment seized him and his whole army, which then followed him in a certain march, and beheld that wonderful sight.

In ^o the mean time, as he said, he began to doubt with himself, what the meaning of this should be: but whilst he was revolving it in his mind, and continued meditating upon it, at length night came on. As he slept, the Christ of God appeared to him with that sign which had appeared in the heavens; and commanded him to make a standard resembling the sign, which he had seen in the heavens, and to use it, as a defence in the battle with his enemies.

As ^p soon as it was day, he arose, and communicated this wonderful thing to his friends. And then sending for such as worked in gold and precious stones, he seated himself in the midst of them, and gave them a description of the sign, and commanded them to make one like it in gold and precious stones; which also we have seen.

The ^q standard is presently afterwards described by Eusebius, who thereupon proceeds again.

Being ^r then deeply affected with that wonderful sight, and resolving to worship no other God but him that had appeared to him; he sent for some of those that were acquainted with the mysteries of his doctrine, and asked them, who that God was, and what was the meaning of the sign he had seen. They told him, that he was God, the only begotten Son of the one and only God: that the sign which had appeared to him was the symbol of immortality, and the trophy of the

ⁿ — ομοίως τε πιστωσάμεν τον λογον, τις αν αμφιβαλοι μη εχει πιστευσαι τω διηγηματι; — αμφι μεσημεριας ηλιω υραι, ηδη της ημερας αποκλινουσας, αυτους οφθαλμοις ιδεν εφη εν αυτω υραν ηπερκειμενον τα ηλιας γαιρω τροπασιον, εκ φωτος συνισταμενον, γραφην τε αυτω συνεσθαι, λεγυσαι, τω νικητα.

δαμνος δ' επι τω διαματι κρατσαι αυτες τε και το γραμματικον απαν, ο δη ελλομενω ποι παρεαν συνεσπελο τε και διαγον ενυλο δαυμαλιος. De V. C. l. i. c. 28. p. 422.

• lb. c. 29.

• lb. c. 30.

• C. 31.

• C. 32.

• victory

‘ victory obtained by him over death, when he was on earth. ‘ They informed him likewise of the causes of his advent, and ‘ gave him accurate instructions concerning his incarnation. ‘ In such discourses as these was he taught : but he was taken ‘ up with the divine appearance that had been afforded him ; ‘ and comparing the heavenly vision with the interpretation ‘ given of it, he was strengthened in mind ; being ‘ fully satisfied, that the knowledge of these matters had been given by ‘ God himself. From that time he resolved to give himself to ‘ the reading of the divine scriptures. And taking those priests ‘ of God for his counsellors, he was persuaded, that the God ‘ he had seen was carefully to be worshipped. Thus filled ‘ with good hopes, he undertook to extinguish the flames of ‘ tyranny.’

This is the account left us by Eusebius, who had it from Constantine himself. And hence it is apparent, I think, that Constantine’s conversion, if he is to be credited, was not the work of men, or of any Christian ministers, but of God himself, together with the reflections he made in his own mind upon past events. And so Theodoret, agreeably enough to this account in Eusebius, says, ‘ that ‘ Constantine was called, ‘ not of men, nor by men, but from heaven, as the divine ‘ apostle Paul was.’

We must, however, make here some remarks, particularly upon the appearance of the luminous cross in the heavens. For it is quite denied by some, who call it “ a fiction, a stratagem,

* — Θεοδιδάκτος αὐτῶν τῶν τελευτῶν γυναικὶ παραινέσαι πειθομένους. ib. p. 424. A. B.

† Οὗ ἐκ ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων, ἐδὲ δὲ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ’ ἐφανέρωται, κατὰ τὸν θεοῦ ἀποστολῶν, τῆς κηρυξέως ταύτης εὐχῆς. Thdr. H. E. l. i. c. e. p. 6. B.

“ Stratagema hoc Constantini non minus scitum, quam illud Philippi Macedonis, quo sacrilegus Phoenices protrivit. Jacob Tollius in not. ad c. 44. libr. de M. P. p. 267. Traj. ad Rhen. 1693. Vid. & ejusd. not. ad c. 46. p. 278, 279.

Mais moy, — trouvant, que le Roi Antigonus, successeur d’ Alexandre le Grand, s’ est servi du même stratagème, seignant d’ avoir veu au ciel une pentagone, qui est le symbole du salut, avec ces paroles, ‘ in ‘ hoc signo vinces,’ & qu’il le fit peindre aux boucliers de ses soldats, & gagna ainsi la bataille : trouvant aussi, qu’un Roi de Portugal a eu la même vision que Constantin, & qu’il a par là remporté la victoire

sur ses ennemis, j’ avoue, qui je considère tous ces miracles comme des finesses militaires des grands capitaines. On trouvera dans tous les siècles une infinité de ces inventions. Preface du même à Longin du Sublime.

Johannes Hoornbeek professor Leydenfis in Examine Bullæ Urbani VIII. de cultu imaginum edito anno 1653, a pagina 181, somnium merum ac fabulam putat Constantini visionem crucis in aëre. H. Norisii Opp. T. iv. p. 661.

Audax enimvero nimium fuit Jacobus Oiselius, qui in Thesauro Numismatum antiquorum pag. 463, ait, eum qui totum hoc negotium de cruce ostensa Constantino ad pias veterum fraudes retulerit, parum a rei veritate aberraturum. Baluz. Annot. ad c. 44. libr. de M. P.

Et vid. omnino C. A. Heummanni Poec. Tom. ii. p. 50, &c. De Cruce Cælesti a Constantino M. conspecta.

a political device of Constantine. It was also looked upon to be a pious fraud by * some in former times.

This opinion, as⁷ Fabricius assures us, has been fully considered and confuted by Mr. Wolff, in a Dissertation which I have not seen; though I should have gladly perused it, if I could have met with it. I mention it however, that they who have an opportunity may consult it. If I should commit any mistakes in the remarks which I propose upon this subject, perhaps they may see them corrected in the Dissertation of that learned writer.

And indeed the cross, which is said to have been seen by Constantine in the heavens, is generally reckoned not only a reality, but a miracle. The fore-mentioned great man, J. A. Fabricius, thinks it² was a natural phænomenon in a solar halo. He therefore allows and contends for the reality of it, though he does not think it properly³ miraculous.

I shall now mention some observations upon this history, which offer themselves to my mind.

1. This relation is delivered by Eusebius upon the sole credit of Constantine: whereas a thing of so public a nature, could not have rested upon his credit and authority only, if it had been true. If such an appearance as this had happened above twenty years before Eusebius wrote the life of Constantine, but yet in his own time, and especially if it had been seen by the whole army with astonishment; he would have been able to call other witnesses to vouch for the truth of it. And out of his dutiful affection for Constantine, and a just concern for his honour, he would not have failed to add something to this purpose: that he had heard the same account from others, who were present, or who had received it from those who were present, and were spectators of that wonderful sight.

2. The oath, or oaths, of Constantine upon this occasion, rather bring his relation into suspicion. A man of virtue and reputation can seldom be under a necessity to corroborate what

* Τὸ το δὲ σημεῖον τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ μὴ οὐκ εἶναι δοκεῖ καὶ πλάσμα, τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς δόγματι κεχαρισμένον. Gelaz. Cyz. de Conc. Nic. l. i. c. iv. ⁷ Argumentis cæteris, quibus totum hoc de visa cruce negotium præfidenter nimis inter commenta adscripserunt viri docti, diatriba singulari Witebergæ A. 1706. edita satisfecit clarissimus doctrina atque ingenio vir & collega meus conjunctissimus Jo. Chr. Wolfius. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. vi. p. 18.

² Vid. ejusdem Exercita. Crit. qua dis-

putatur crucem, quam in cælis vidisse se juravit Constantinus Imp. fuisse phænomenon naturale in halone solari. Ap. Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 3. T. vi. p. 8, &c.

³ At si me audis, non statim hinc, quod faciunt multi, crucem illam a Constantino visam totam callidis adscribes commentis. — sed vere oblatam ipsius oculis credes tot testibus antiquis, Constantino denique ipsi, saltem jurato: neque tamen illico propterea eam stupebis tanquam rem miraculis proprie accensendam. Id. ib. p. 9.

he says with an oath; especially, when he is speaking to a friend, who too, if the thing were true, must have known it long before, from the report of general fame, and many credible accounts. I put some thoughts of another relating to this in the (D) margin.

3. Eusebius renders this whole account suspicious, by not mentioning the place of this wonderful sight; a necessary and proper circumstance to be taken notice of in such a history. It hence appears to me probable, that Eusebius himself did not believe this story, nor intend to vouch for the truth of it. Constantine's army, he says, was following him in a certain march: this expression seems to me, designed as a hint to the readers, not to depend upon the truth of what had been said. So that if notwithstanding this caution of Eusebius, any believe the story, he is scarce accountable for their mistake: it is to be ascribed to their own credulity.

4. There are other things concerning the standard related by Eusebius, which he also had from Constantine, and, I think, are very unlikely, if not altogether incredible. Our historian says, that ^b wherever the standard was, the enemies fled: which may have been true enough, in many instances. It might animate Constantine's soldiers, and terrify the enemy. It is added by him, 'That ^c there was a company of fifty chosen men, remarkable for strength of body, and valour of mind, and piety, appointed to attend the standard, and to relieve each other by turns in bearing it; and that the person who held it was always safe. For ^d the salutary trophy was a safeguard to him that bore it; insomuch, that though darts were cast at it, he who bore the standard was always unhurt, the spear of the standard receiving the darts. This was a thing surpassing all miracles, that the darts of the enemy should light upon the narrow circumference of the spear, and there stick fast, and the standard-bearer be safe. Yea, never was any one wounded in this service. This is not our account,

(D) Ipse Eusebius hanc objectionem sentit. Quapropter in V. C. c. 22. magna cautione præfatur, rem admirabilem esse, & vix credibilem, nisi Imperator ipse, sed longo tempore post, ipsi eam narrasset, & juramento confirmasset. — Saltem illud urgeri licebit: Si totus exercitus prodigium illud vidit, quo pudore Eusebius potuit, præterdere tanti in vulgus notissimi ignorantiam? quo colore poterit persuadere lectioni, id ob incredulitatem debuisse ab Imperatore juramento confirmari? Observ. Hallens. xxiv. T. i. p. 394.

^b V. C.

I. ii. c. 7.

^c Ib. c. 8.

^d Τὴν δὲ το σῶτηριον τροπαίον αἰωνίου ζωῆς ἐστὶν οὐλακίηριον· ὡς πολλὰκις βίβλων καὶ αὐτὴν περιπορευόμενοι, τοὺς μὲν φερόμενα διασώζεσθαι· τὸ δὲ τὴν τροπαίαν δορυ διχισθαι τὰ βαλλόμενα. Καὶ ἡ δὲ τὴν οὐλακίαν ἐπιτεταμένη δαυμάλιος, πῶς ἐν βραχυτάτῃ περιφέρειᾳ τὴν δορυάκιον ἐκτεταμένην τὰ τῶν πολέμων βέλῃ, ἐν αὐτῇ μὲν πηλὴν μετὰ κατεπερίεστον — οὐχὲν κινούμενος δ' ὁ λόφος, ἀλλ' αὐτὴ παλιν βασανισθεὶς, εἰς ἡμέτερας ἀκὰς πρὸς εἰρηρὰς καὶ τῶν ἀπομνημονεύσαντες. Ib. c. 9.

' but

‘but the emperor’s, who among other matters, told this also to us.’

So Eusebius concludes this account, who but a little before had used the like expressions* in this relation; thus careful was he, not to make himself answerable for the truth of it. And indeed, this is above all miracles, I mean above all credible accounts of miracles; that when many darts were thrown, none should strike the bearer, nor yet light upon the upper part of the standard, where was the cross, and the motto, but only, and always, upon the narrow circumference of the spear, or pole of the standard.

5. Lactantius, or whoever was the author of the book Of the Deaths of Persecutors, who undoubtedly wrote a few years after this appearance in the heavens is supposed to have happened, says nothing of it, but only mentions Constantine’s dream or vision in his sleep. That this author speaks of nothing else, and that his words are not to be understood of any sign seen by Constantine in the sky, is plainly shewn by Fabricius† himself: who observes likewise, that some other authors besides mention the dream only. Basnage too is clearly of opinion, that‡ this author speaks only of Constantine’s dream, and says nothing of the cross seen in the heavens. And he likewise observes the silence of so many other writers as to that sight, that he seems very much to weaken the credit of the thing. He however allows, that Constantine really received a

* Ταύλα βασιλεὺς αὐτὸς τοῖς τῆς γραφῆς ποιημένοις—ὡφελῆς. lb. c. 8. fin.

† De M. P. c. 44. Vid. infr. not. 8.

‡ Solet etiam pro confirmanda hac re ad Lactantium provocari. Sed ille de cruce visa in cælo tacet. Solum somnium commemorat libro de M. P. cap. 44. Commemorat est in quiete Constantius, ut Cæleste signum Dei notaret in scutis, atque ita prælium committeret. &c. Posset quidem videri a Lactantio dici cæleste signum Dei, quasi in cælo ostensum a Deo, & in cælo a Constantino visum. Verum qui hoc in dubium vocaturus esset, facile posset asserre plura loca scriptorum Græcorum, Latinorumque, quibus sine ullo respectu ad Constantini visionem crux vocatur signum cæleste. —Somnium quoque, quod miror, commemorat non Johannes modo Malala in Chronica Historia. l. ii. p. 2. — sed quoque antiquior longe Rufinus. l. ix. H. E. cap. 9. & ex eo auctor Hist. Miscellæ xi. 7, &c. — Fabric. Diff. Crit. § 3. ap. Bib. Gr. ut sup. p. 11, 12. ^h Ac primum, Lactantius, qui magister datus Crispo Cæ-

sari, familiari Constantini colloquio usus est sæpius, de diurno crucis trophæo ex luce conflato ne verbum quidem habet. Hæc tantum habet: Commemorat est in quiete Constantinus, ut cæleste signum Dei notaret in scutis, atque ita prælium committeret. —Argumenti vires intendit Rufinus in Eusebianæ Historiæ versione: Constantinus vidit per soporem ad orientis partem in cælo signum crucis igneo fulgore rutilare. Dormienti igitur, non vigili cæleste signum Constantino oblatum est, idque prædicabat traditio, quæ Rufini tetigit aures. Visi quoque diurni Sozomenus ignarus est. Belli Maxentiani curis distractus Constantinus vidit in somnis signum crucis in cælo resplendens. Sozom. l. i. c. 3. — Denique Ethnicorum nullus historicorum celeberrimæ hujus visionis meminit. — Itaque sunt eruditi, qui in somnio divinitus profecto visam a Constantino crucis figuram existiment, quorum unus Johannes Columbus in notis ad Lactantium. Basnag. A. 312. n. 5.

divine

divine
cross i
truth o
rest up
of the
Eusebi
ror, as
be tak
We

W
torians
Sozom
pearan
Christ
of it,
bius f
believ
pearan
himsel
it mul
his lea

Th
so ma
so rem
the ca
is pro
the re
in his
but in
our E
cross
And t
mann
the fi
was g
When
ward
Const
vailin

(E)
the vi
down t
upon t
does no
duceth
affirms,

divine admonition in his sleep, to make use of the sign of the cross in his wars. But in my mind he has also overthrown the truth of the vision in Constantine's dream; for this must solely rest upon the emperor's word: but by denying the appearance of the cross in the heavens, which Constantine confirmed to Eusebius with an oath, he so weakens the credit of the emperor, as to this whole matter, that nothing concerning it can be taken upon the authority of his testimony only.

We may farther observe, that since several ecclesiastical historians, who wrote after Eusebius, particularly Rufinus, and (E) Sozomen, (as is shewn by Basnage,) insist not upon the appearance of the cross in the heavens; there were at that time Christians, as well as others, who either were totally ignorant of it, or else did not credit the account, as related by Eusebius from Constantine. Indeed, it seems not reasonable, to believe the relation of any one man, concerning a public appearance, which is attested by no others. Nor did Eusebius himself believe it, as I have sufficiently shewn already; though it must be owned, that Constantine did his best to impose upon his learned friend, the bishop of Cæsarea.

This difference in the account, together with the silence of so many historians, about the sight in the heavens, is a thing so remarkable, that some perhaps may have a curiosity to know the cause of it. I shall therefore mention one conjecture: it is probable, that when Constantine first informed people of the reason that induced him to make use of the sign of the cross in his armies, he alleged nothing but a dream for that purpose; but in the latter part of his life, when he was acquainted with our Eusebius, he added the other particular, of a luminous cross seen somewhere by him and his army in the day-time. And the emperor having related this, and in the most solemn manner, Eusebius thought himself obliged to mention it. But the first account had been so long and so often told, that it was generally known, and the only one that was so known. Whence it came to pass, that historians a good while afterwards related the vision in the dream, as the original cause of Constantine's using the cross, that being the common and prevailing tradition concerning it.

(2) It is true, that after his account of the vision in the dream, Sozomen puts down the other story. But he relates it upon the sole authority of Eusebius, and does not confirm it as true. For he introduceth it in this manner: Eusebius indeed affirms, that he had heard the emperor say,

with an oath, that he had seen the trophy of the cross about noon when the day was declining.—Εὐσεβίος γὰρ μὴν οὐ παμφίλῳ, αὐτῷ φησάδης ἐνωμότως τῷ βασιλεὺς ἀκηκοέναι ισχυρίζεται, ὡς ἀμφὶ μεσημβρίαν. κ. λ. l. i. c. 3. p. 404. A.

Whether

Whether the author of the book *Of the Deaths of Persecutors* makes any mention of the sight of the cross in the heavens, or not; many learned men think, that by way of conclusion, they have learned from him the place, day and hour, of the appearance to Constantine, about which there have been so many disputes; and that this author has put an end to that controversy. Itⁱ happened, they say, in Constantine's camp, when he was besieging Rome, on the 26th day of October.

But with due submission to the judgments of so many learned men, I question, whether this be yet a clear point. Let us then now at last take the words of this writer. 'Now^k the war was begun between Maxentius and Constantine. Maxentius himself continued at Rome; but he had good generals to command his army.—The two armies engaged, and that of Maxentius had the better: yet Constantine afterwards took courage, and being prepared for either event, marched all his forces near to Rome, and posted them opposite to the Milvian bridge. The 27th of October was now near, which was the anniversary of Maxentius's empire, and his fifth year was almost out. Constantine was warned in a dream to put the divine heavenly mark [the sign of the cross] upon the shields of the soldiers, and so to give battle. He took care to execute this, and ordered (F) the letter X circumflexed at the top, denoting the name of Christ, to be put on all their shields. Having taken this for his distinction, he drew out his army.'

Hence it is argued, It being already known from Eusebius, that the trophy of the cross was seen by Constantine in the heavens in the afternoon: and that the very next night, when he was in doubt about the meaning of it, Christ appeared to him,

ⁱ Constituendum est, visionem illam crucis Constantino ostenſæ contigisse in caſtris, dum Romam obſideret, vii. cal. Novembris anno Chr. 312. Baluz. not. ad l. de M. P. c. 44. p. 97.

Obtulit ſeſe crux videnda Constantino poſt prælia cum barbaris commiſſa, de quibus Nazarius in Panegyrico c. 18. ſub dio in caſtris, cum Romam obſideret an. Chr. 312. die vii. cal. Nov. Hoc recte colligit Steph. Baluzius. Fabr. Diff. de cruce Conſt. M. n. vi. ap. B. Gr. T. vi. p. 15. Vid. & Pagi Crit. in Baron. 312. n. v.

^k Jam mota inter eos fuerant arma civilia. Et quamvis ſe Maxentius Romæ contineret, — tamen bellum per idoneos duces gerebatur — Dimicatum — & Maxentianj milites prævalebant, donec poſtea con-

firmato animo Conſtantine, & ad utrumque paratus, copias omnes ad urbem propius admovit, & e regione pontis Milvi conſedit. Imminebat dies quo Maxentius imperium ceperat, qui eſt ad ſextum calendæ Novembris, & quinquennalia terminabantur: Commonitus eſt in quiete Conſtantine, ut cæleſte ſignum Dei notaret in ſcutis, atque ita prælium committeret. Fecit ut juſſus eſt, & tranſverſa X litera ſummo capite circumflexo Chriſto in ſcutis notaret. Quo ſigno armatus exercitus caput ferrum. De M. P. c. 44. in.

(F) The author's words are obſcure. They are thus explained by G. Cuper upon the place: 'Chriſtum in ſcutis notat' id eſt, Chriſti nomen, quod exprimitur per duas primas ſalutaris vocis literas.

as he slept, with the sign that had appeared in the heavens, and commanded him to make a resemblance of it, and use it in his army: therefore both the visions happened in the same place, and within the space of a few hours of each other. The fore-mentioned author having assured us, that the dream, or night-vision, was in the night of the 26th of October, 312, the appearance in the day-time was also on the 26th of October. So^t Pagi, and in like manner other learned men, who are of the same opinion.

But it seems to me, that this author compared with Eusebius, will not determine the time, either of the appearance of the cross in the heavens, or of the dream. On the 27th day of October, Constantine fought with Maxentius, and overcame him. But he could not have the dream in the preceding night, because Eusebius assures us, that the next day after the night-vision, Constantine sent for men who wrought in gold and precious stones, and seating himself in the midst of them, he gave them directions for making the standard. The day succeeding the night-vision therefore was not a day of battle.

Farther, it is next to impossible, that the shields of Constantine's soldiers throughout his army, should be marked with the sign of the cross on the 27th of October, the day he fought with Maxentius, if the dream had happened but the night (c) before.

Lastly, I see no reason so to understand the passage of the fore-cited author, as to assure us, that the dream happened in the night before the 27th of October. He has no words that express the time of the dream; and it may be as well supposed, according to his account, that Constantine had the dream before he came to besiege Rome, some short time after his defeat by Maxentius: when, as this writer says, in bishop Burnet's version, 'Yet Constantine for that did not lose heart:' or, as the words may be better rendered, 'Yet Constantine afterwards took courage, and resolving to hazard all, he marched on to the gates of Rome.' The time, when Constantine took courage, or was strengthened in mind, seems to me, so far as

¹ Crit. in Baron. 312. 2. 5.

(c) This writer does not speak of one standard only. But he says, that Constantine was directed in a dream, to 'put the heavenly mark upon his soldiers shields.' Allowing, that a single standard, adorned as Eusebius describes it, might be made in the forenoon, and a battle fought after-

wards: yet it is not easy to conceive, that the soldiers shields, throughout an whole army, should receive a new mark in a few hours. Therefore, in all probability, this author did not suppose the day immediately succeeding the dream to be the day, on which Constantine fought with and overcame Maxentius.

we can judge from this writer, as likely a time as any, for Constantine's thinking of the use of the cross: that time was a little before he resolved to march to Rome.

Upon the whole then it appears to me, that this author has led us to the time, when the sign of the cross began to be made use of by Constantine in his armies and battles. It was in the last battle with Maxentius; some short time at least before which battle, and the day of it, the thought of employing this sign must have come into Constantine's mind: whether by divine revelation and admonition, or his own politic contrivance, let the inquisitive judge, after mature thought and consideration.

I do not in the least doubt, but that about the time of his victory over Maxentius, or rather, probably, some time before it, Constantine became a sincere Christian, and continued so the remaining part of his life, and educated his children in the same belief. And his conversion might be partly owing to his own reflections upon the state of things, and partly to conversation and discourse with Christian ministers and people; with whom Constantine, son of Constantius their friend and favourer, must have been for some time well acquainted. But I think, that Constantine was a politician, as well as a Christian. A change of religion is attended with hazards, and is likely to expose men to difficulties, of which great men especially are sensible: and Constantine was willing to reconcile the minds of men to this change, and to secure himself therein, as well as he could. He might also aim at making some advantage of it, and improving it as a mean of success in his designs, and of victory over his enemies. And for those ends, the standard of the cross, and the mark of it upon his soldiers shields, would be of no small service.

As for the story which Constantine told Eusebius, of the perpetual safety of the standard-bearer in the greatest dangers, and the darts of the enemies sticking fast in the narrow circumference of the spear; it must be owned, that here Constantine over-did it, and exceeded almost the bounds of modesty, as well as of all reasonable probability. Some indulgence however is due to Constantine, with regard to this fine contrivance of using the salutary trophy in his battles: we are all apt to be too fond of our own inventions.

I have insisted chiefly on the history of Constantine's conversion, which we have left us by Eusebius. Photius in his abridgment of Philostorgius's Ecclesiastical History, says,

‘ That

That^m writer, agreeably to other historians, relates, that the cause of Constantine the great's conversion from Gentilism to Christianity, was his victory over Maxentius. At which time also, the sign of the cross was seen eastward, extended to a great length, shining with a surprizing brightness, stars at the same time surrounding it like a rainbow, and composing the form of letters in the Latin tongue, expressing these words, BY THIS CONQUER.'

From which I think we may conclude, upon the authority of that learned Patriarch, that the general account of the more ancient historians was, that Constantine was converted in or about the year 312. Eusebius makes Constantine to have chosen the God whom he should worship, before the victory over Maxentius, asⁿ does Sozomen expressly, when he relates the vision of the cross in Constantine's sleep. Philostorgius says, that victory was the cause of Constantine's conversion. They are easily reconciled by only supposing, that the victory, which Constantine obtained over Maxentius, confirmed the dispositions, which were before begun to be formed in him.

Zosimus says, that it was not till after the death of Crispus and Fausta, that Constantine became a Christian; that is, not before the year 325, or 326. 'For,' as he^o says, 'Constantine being conscious to himself of those bad actions, and also of the breach of oaths, and being told by the priests of his old religion, that there was no kind of purgation sufficient to expiate such enormities; he began to hearken to a Spaniard, named Ægyptius, then at court, who assured him, that the Christian doctrine contained a promise of the pardon of all manner of sins.'

But that is a false and absurd story; and Sozomen has^p a chapter on purpose to confute such accounts of Constantine's conversion. It is true, however, that Constantine was not baptized till after those events; which I take to have been, in part, the foundation of that story. And it is not impossible, nor very improbable, that this might be one reason of Constantine's deferring his baptism, as he did, till near his death, [though he might also have other reasons]: thinking this would be some security to him, and fearing, lest he should be guilty of some great sin after baptism, if he long survived it.

^m Οτι την τε μεγάλην Κωνσταντίνου μεταβολήν εκ της ιδιαιτης δρασεως εις τον Χριστιανισμον, και εις τοις αλλοις φεγγομενος, αλλα γενεσθαι αναγραφει την καλα Μαξιμιανου. κ. λ. Philost. l. i. c. 6.

ⁿ Ητοιχα γαρ επιγραφειστας Μαξιμιανου εβι-

βηλευσιν, — εν τοιαυταις δε φρονισι, γενομενος, ωσαυτ ειδη το τε σαρην σημειον εν τω ηρατι σελαιζειν. Soz. l. i. c. 3. in.

^o Zof. l. ii. p. 685.

^p Sozom.

l. i. c. 5.

Du Pin seems to have suspected some such thing, when he says, 'It may be thought strange, that Constantine was not baptized till now. But so it is: and whether he deferred to receive baptism till he was ready to die, that by that sacrament he might expiate all his sins, and appear innocent before God, or whether he had any other reason for that delay; he did not prepare himself for baptism, till he found himself sick; nor procure the imposition of the hands of the bishops, for putting him into the rank of Catechumens, till the year 337, a few days before his death.'

Since, then, Constantine did so long defer to receive baptism, which was well known to be the initiating rite of the Christian religion, it is very likely, that this delay may have been one ground of that common opinion among heathen people concerning Constantine's late conversion.

Another reason of that opinion may have been, that after the intire conquest, and death of Licinius, (which also was soon followed with the death of Crispus,) Constantine appeared more openly a Christian, and more vigorously attacked heathenism by his edicts, than he had done before, when his empire was not so completely settled.

We have now seen the accounts of Constantine's conversion, which generally prevailed. Whether it was also in part a piece of policy, though accompanied with serious conviction, we cannot certainly say: for if it was, we are not to expect any hints of such a reason in the ecclesiastical historians of those times, or near them. But we learn from more than one writer, that about the same time Maxentius, son of the persecutor Maximian Herculus, and brother-in-law to Constantine, after his marriage with Fausta, began to flatter and compliment the Christians. Eusebius says, 'Maxentius', son of the fore-mentioned Maximian, who had possessed himself of Rome, at first made an hypocritical profession of our religion, to please and flatter the people of Rome; and commanded those in subjection to him, to forbear persecuting the Christians: making a show of piety, and desiring to appear much more just and mild than his predecessors. But in time he shewed himself by his actions to be very different from what was hoped of him.'

q Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 16.

r — αρχόμενος μὲν τῇ καὶ ἡμῶν πίστεϊ
ἐν ἀρεσκείᾳ καὶ κατανίᾳ τῶ δυνάμει βασιλέως
καυτοκρινάτο. Τὰς δὲ τοῦ σπυλίου τοῦ

καὶ Χριστιανῶν ἀνέκων προφάσει διαστή-
μις ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιμονὴν, καὶ δὲ H. E. l.
viii. c. 24. iii.

This was in the beginning of his reign, therefore in * 306, or 307. And it must be looked upon as an order for restraining the persecution of the Christians in that part of the empire, which was then subject to Maxentius; namely, at Rome, and throughout Italy.

And Optatus speaks of an end^t being put to the persecution in Africa by an edict of Maxentius; which probably happened in the year^u 311, or^x 312, but not before^y 311, because Maxentius was not sooner master of Africa, which till then was held by Alexander.

However, if there is no positive evidence, that political views and considerations had any influence in the change of Constantine, it is nevertheless very honourable to the Christian religion, and the professors of it, both in that, and former times, that though they had never had the princes of this world on their side, and they had endured from their first original a variety of difficulties, and several open persecutions, and were now under a severe persecution, which had raged with great violence for several years, in most parts of the Roman empire; yet at this very time, of those who were contending for worldly power and empire, one actually favoured and flattered them, and another may be suspected^z to have joined himself to them, partly, from considerations of interest. So greatly had this people increased under external disadvantages of all sorts!

IV. Having thus related the time, and causes of Constantine's conversion, we will observe some of his actions as a Christian, or a favourer of Christians.

1. The author of the book *Of the Deaths of Persecutors* informs us, that^a Constantine, immediately upon his becoming emperor, restored the Christians their liberty. This liberty must be supposed to have extended over Britain and Gaul, which were then under Constantine. And hereby, I think, must be chiefly intended liberty of public worship: for his father, Constantius, had not persecuted them: all that he had

* Vid. Pag. 306. n. 23, 24.

^t Tempestas persecutionis peracta, & desinita est. Jubente Deo, indulgentiam mittente Maxentio, Christianis libertas est restituta. Optat. l. i. n. 18.

^u Prius deserbuerat anno 305. Sed subinde recruduerat, nec pax omnino reddita, nisi postquam Maxentius rerum in Africa potitus est anno 311. Du Pin ad Optat. loc.

^x Vid. Pag. 306. n. 23.

^y Vid. Bain. Ann. 311. n. 15.

^z Avant que trois siècles se soient écoulés depuis la mort de J. Christ, le parti des Chrétiens est déjà si fort, qu'un Empereur l'embrasse sans craindre celui des Payens. Il semble même, que bien loin d'affoiblir par là sa puissance, il l'augmenta & la fortifia par ce moien. Sermons de S. Werenfels, p. 27. 1723.

^a Suscepto imperio Constantinus Augustus nihil egit prius quam Christianos cultui ac Deo suo reddere. c. 24.

allowed of, and consented to, was the demolition of their places of worship. If any suffered death in his part of the empire, (as doubtless some did,) it must have been owing to popular tumults, or the sentences of inferior officers and magistrates, without express commission from him.

The next thing we meet with in the history of Constantine, in favour of the Christians, is an edict^b published jointly by him and Licinius, in the year 312, probably at^c Rome, soon after the defeat of Maxentius. It was also sent to Maximin in the east, to be published by him, for the benefit of the Christians in that part of the Roman empire. Eusebius calls it a full and complete law for Christians. But it is not now^d extant.

In the next year 313, another edict was published by the joint authority of Constantine and Licinius, at^e Milan, where they^f were on account of the marriage of Licinius with Constantia, Constantine's sister. This edict we still have in the original Latin in the book^g Of the Deaths of Persecutors, and in a Greek version, in^h Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History. Hereinⁱ liberty is given to Christians in particular, and to all men in general, to make an undisturbed profession of their religious sentiments. Moreover it is ordained, that all places of worship, which had been taken from the Christians, by whomsoever then possessed, should be restored to the said Christians without delay, and without any price to be paid or demanded of them on that account: and the loss, which any might hereby suffer, to be referred to the imperial judgment, to determine what amends should be proper to be made to those, who were seized of such places, either by grant or purchase. It is likewise herein ordained, that all other places, beside those wherein their assemblies had been held, which had belonged to any churches in common, as bodies corporate,

^b Καὶ δὴ ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς τε Κωνσταντίνος καὶ συν αὐτῷ βασιλεὺς Λικίνιος. — ἀμφω μιᾷ βουλῇ καὶ γνώμῃ νόμον ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν τελευτάστον πλεονεργαῖα διατυπώσαι. — Καὶ τὸν νόμον αὐτοῖς, Μαξιμιανὸν τὸν ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς ἔχοντι ἐν Δυναστεύῃ, Φιλίαν τε πρὸς αὐτὸς ὑποκρίνομενον διατυπώσαι. Euf. H. E. l. ix. c. 9. p. 360. A. B. ^c Secundum edictum Mediolani, ut suo loco videbimus, prius loco incerto datum: videtur tamen Romæ, ubi reliquo hoc anno Constantinus egit, promulgatum. Pagi 312. n. 10.

^d Vid. Valef. annot. ad Euf. l. x. c. 5. Pagi 312. n. 10. 314. n. 9. Bafn. 313.

n. 10, 11.

^e Euf. l. x. c. 5. p. 388. c. De M. P. c. 48.

^f Constantinus rebus in Urbe compositis, hyeme proxima Mediolanum contendit. Eodem Licinius, ut acciperet uxorem. De M. P. c. 45. in § cap. 48.

^h l. x. c. 5.

ⁱ Vel in primis ordinanda esse credidimus, quibus divinitatis reverentia continebatur, ut daremus & Christianis & omnibus liberam potestatem sequendi religionem, quam quisque voluisset. — ut in colenda, quod quisque diligeret, habeat liberam potestatem. De M. P. c. 48.

should

should be restored to them without fraud or dispute, upon the terms before-mentioned.

2. There was about the same time a letter sent to Anulinus, proconsul of the province of Africa, signifying, as Eusebius says, that ^k the imperial beneficence was intended for the catholic church only; that is, the places of worship, or other things, that had been taken from the Christians, were to be restored to the catholics.

There follows soon after in Eusebius ^l, the copy of a letter of Constantine to Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage; wherein the emperor informs him, that he had sent orders to Ursus, receiver-general for Africa, to give a certain sum of money for the use of ^m several ministers of the genuine and most holy catholic religion, throughout all the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and each Mauritania.

In the next place, we have a ⁿ letter of Constantine to the fore mentioned Anulinus, giving immunity from civil or burdensome offices to the Christian clergy within his province, who are of the catholic church, over which Cæcilian presides.

In the year 313, Constantine ^o appointed a synod at Rome, and in 314, another at Arles, to compose the differences between Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, and the Donatists.

3. Eusebius informs us, that ^p Constantine, when possessed of the whole empire, (which could not be before the year 324, and after Licinius was subdued,) sent letters to all the provinces, written in Greek and Latin, acknowledging the goodness of God to him, and ascribing his successes to the favour of divine providence. Now the provinces of the east became equally sensible of the emperor's favour and goodness, with the provinces of the west. Our ecclesiastical historian has left us ^q a copy of Constantine's edict, sent particularly to the people of the province of Palestine, the original of which was in his own possession. Herein the emperor restores those who had been banished, or proscribed, or confined in islands, or who had been condemned to the mines or any other public works. It is herein ordained, that Christians, who had been deprived of any military posts, may resume them, or betake themselves to any other kind of life they choose, and therein enjoy repose and honour. They who had been condemned to slavery in the public works, are restored to freedom, and to all the honours

^k — μὴ τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ καὶ ἀγιάστῃ καθολικῇ θρησκείᾳ. ib. p. 293. A. ⁿ ib. c. 7. ^o ib. l. 1. ^p Vit. Const. x. c. 5. p. 391, 392. ^q ib. c. 24—42. ^l ib. c. 6. ^m ib. c. 23. ^r ib. c. 23.

which before they were intitled to. All goods, and lands, and houses, which had been confiscated, are to be restored to the original possessors or proprietors: or, if they were dead, whether martyrs or confessors, to their heirs and successors. If such, who had been deprived of their rights, have no relations left, the church of the place where they had lived, is to be their heir, and succeed to them. All these things, whether lands, houses, gardens, or country seats, are to be restored, but not the mean profits. This law of restitution is to be understood to relate to the public treasury, as well as to other possessors. And besides this, the cœmeteries are to be restored to the several churches to which they had belonged. All which things, as^r the historian assures us, were performed and executed, according to the tenor of this law.

After this, as the historian farther assures us, Constantine^a gave the government of the provinces chiefly to Christians: and when any Gentiles were made governors, they were prohibited to sacrifice: which law comprehended not only presidents of provinces, but also higher officers, and even the prætorian præfects. If they were Christians, they were required to act according to their principles: if they were otherwise disposed, yet the practice of idolatrous rites was forbidden.

Afterwards there were published^t two laws at the same time, one forbidding the detestable rites of idolatry, of old time used in cities and villages; wherein it was enacted, that for the future none should erect statues of gods, or practise divination, or offer any sacrifice. The other law was for enlarging Christian oratories and churches, or for rebuilding them more lofty, grand, and splendid.

Moreover, the emperor still making progress in piety, wrote^u an Oration against idolatry; which was sent to the several provinces of the empire, both in the east and the west. In this Oration Constantine says, that^x during the late persecution the barbarians received and entertained kindly the Christians that fled to them, and allowed them the liberty to worship God according to their own sentiments: which, he says, was a reproach upon the Roman name, in that barbarians were more merciful than they. In another part of the Oration he expresseth his desire, that^y the Gentiles, who are in error, may enjoy the same peace and quiet with believers, as being con-

^r ib. c. 43.^s ib. c. 44.^t c. 45, 46.^u c. 47—60.^x c. 53.^y Ομοίαν τοις πιστευουσιν^a πλανώμενοι χαίροντες λαμβανύσσαν, ειρήνης τε καὶ ησυχίας απολαύσιν. Αὐτῇ

γὰρ ἡ τῆς κοινῆς ἐπαγορεύσεως, καὶ πρὸς
εὐθείαν ἀγαγεῖν ὁδὸν ἰσχυρί. Μὴδὲς τοῦ
ἱεροῦ παρενοχλεῖν. ἕκαστος ἐπὶ τῇ ψυχῇ
βελήται, τιθεὶς καὶ πράττειν. ib. c. 46.

ducive to the bringing them into the right way. Let every one do, says he, what his soul desires. He wishes that all were unanimous in the truth, and in obedience to God's holy laws: nevertheless, if any dissent, and withdraw themselves, let them have their temples of lies, since² they choose them.

Such is that Oration: and Eusebius assures us, that^a the emperor would sit up whole nights, employing himself in study and meditation, for improving his own mind, and composing Orations, which he afterwards spoke in numerous assemblies.

4. After this Oration, Eusebius gives^b an account of some differences and controversies among the Christians themselves, which occasioned the calling of the council of Nice in 325, where Constantine was present.

5. We have also^c an account in Eusebius, of several churches built by Constantine's order, and at the public expence; as the churches at Bethlehem, and mount Olivet, and the church of the Sepulchre, called (H) also Anastasis or the church of the Resurrection, at Jerusalem. Which last was very magnificent, and was solemnly^d consecrated by Constantine's special order, in the year 335.

Eusebius does indeed in one place say, that^e Helena built two churches, one at Bethlehem, the place of our Saviour's nativity; the other at mount Olivet, the place of his ascension. But the meaning is no more than what is said by him just before, that^f Constantine let her have the honour of founding or building those churches.

Nevertheless, Socrates^g and some other ancient writers, ascribe to Helena the building of all the three fore-mentioned churches or temples in Palestine. But it must be better, I think, to rely upon Eusebius himself, with whom also Sozomen agrees^h intirely. Besides, Helena was in that country but a very short time: she could not go thither, before Constantine's conquest of Licinius in 324. According to the course of Eusebius's narration, this journey of Helena was undertaken after the Council of Nice, which was held in 325, and when she was of a great age; as is particularly observed by^{h^h} Theodoret.

^a Οἱ δ' ἐκείναι ἀφελκόμενες, ἐχούσας βάλω-
μεναι τὰ τῆς ψευδοθείας τεύχη. *ibid.*

^b De V. C. l. iv. c. 29. *in.* ^b *ib.*

^c Vid. de V. C. l. iii.

^d (H) That by the Mar-

tation, or church of the Sepulchre, and

Anastasis, are to be understood one and the

same building, see Valef. ad l. iv. De V.

C. c. 47.

^e De V. C. l. iv. c.

42—43.

^f — δύο νῆας ἀφιερεῖ· τὸν δ' ἐπι-

κεῖν τὴν τῆς γενέσεως ἀντροῦ· τὸν δ' ἐπι-

κεῖν τῆς ἀναλήψεως οὐρούς. De V. C. l. iii.

c. 43. *in.* ^f — τῆς τῆς μήτρος —

διακονίζων τὴν μετάνοιαν. *ib.* c. 41.

^g Socr. l. i. c. 17. ^h ἐν μαρτυρίᾳ δὲ καὶ

ἐλπίδι ἡ αὐτὴ μήνη δύο νῆας ἀποδομῆται. κ. λ.

Soz. l. ii. c. 2. *in.* ^{h^h} Αὐτὴ τῶν τῆς

οδοπορίας ποταμῶν ἀνασχομένη, καὶ τῆς γῆρας

ἡ ληίσταμένη τὰ παθῆ· προ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι

τῆς τελευταίας ἀποδημίας ταύτης ἐξέλαλο,

οὐδοποροῦσας δὲ τῆς βίης το τεῖμα κατεβλή-

φει. H. E. l. i. c. 18. *in.*

And according to all accounts, she died at Rome, or near it, in 326, or soon after.

6. It is well known likewise, that Helena is said to have found at Jerusalem the real cross on which our Saviour suffered. This is related by several writers of the fourth and fifth centuries; but with so many different circumstances, as to render the whole story doubtful. And, which is very material, there is nothing said of it in Eusebius: his silence is the more remarkable, because he has¹ with great particularity related the clearing of the ground about the sepulchre, and expatiates very much in his account of the temple there built by Constantine. As the silence of Eusebius is alone satisfactory upon this head, I forbear to confute at large the common accounts of the invention of the cross; and only refer to a few authors, who^k seem to me to have made good observations upon them.

Montfaucon pleased himself with the thought, that in the Commentary upon the Psalms, published by him, Eusebius had referred^l to the miracles, said by Rufinus, Sozomen, and others, to have been done at Christ's sepulchre, when Helena was at Jerusalem. But I humbly conceive, that there is no ground for that supposition: Eusebius says no more in his^m Commentary upon the Psalms, than he had done inⁿ the Life of Constantine. The finding, after so long a space of time, the sepulchre of our Saviour, which had been hid by rubbish, and by buildings placed over it by the heathens, the raising a magnificent temple upon the spot by the order of an emperor, the journey of Helena to Jerusalem, the great concourse of people there, and other things, appeared to him wonderful facts, that exhibited to the world a proof of Christ's death and resurrection, as related by the evangelists, and foretold by the prophets. Valeſius^o understood our author in this manner:

ⁱ Vid. de V. C. l. iii. c. 26, &c.

^k Vid. Basnag. Ann. 326. n. ix. x. Jacob Gothofredi Notæ seu Dissertationes in Philostorg. c. 14. p. 388, &c. Witſii Miscellan. T. ii. Exercita xii. p. 361. — 369. Chamier. Panſtrat. l. xxii. c. 4. Le Clerc. Bibl. Ancien. & Mod. T. xvi. p. 112, &c.

^l De miraculis in Sepulchro & Martyrio Christi editis ne verbum quidem habet Eusebius in Vita Constantini: etsi detectum, curante Helena, Sepulchrum & Martyrium memoret — verum hic de miraculis agi quæ a Rufino, Sulpitio Severo, Socrate — recensentur, ne ambigas. Mont. Prælim. in Euseb. Comm. in Pf. p. 8.

^m Et de tīs τοις νυν επιτεθει

τοις καθ' ημας ἀμφι το μνημα, και το μαρτυριον τη σωτηριος ημων επιτελεσθεσι δαμασκιο, αληθως εισιαι οπως περιληφται ερσεις τα τεθεισπισμεινα. Euseb. Comm. in Pf. 87. p. 545. B.

ⁿ — αὐτο δὲ λοιπον το σημειον και παραλειπον της σωτηριος αναγκαστως μαρτυριον παρ' ἑλπιδα πασαν ανεφαινετο και τοτε — αἱροι — διο μετα την εν σκωτι καλαδυσιν, αυθις επι το φωσ προκει, και τοις επι δεαν αφικνηται τοις αληθ παρειχει οραν των αυθοι περιλαμβανω δαμασκων την ιεροαν — ερσεις απασης γελωλεως φωνης την τη σωτηριος αναγκασιν μαρτυριον. De V. C. l. iii. c. 28. Vid. & c. 29, 30. & 26.

^o Est autem hic hujus loci sensus: illam Domini sepulchri

and

and it was very natural for the Christians of that time, who had been witnesses of the sufferings of their brethren, and of the extreme contempt cast upon every thing that bore the name of Jesus, or belonged to him, to behold these alterations with astonishment. The fault was, that they were not only surprized at them, but were too much pleased with the external peace, splendor, and prosperity of the church.

These are thoughts which offered themselves to me, upon reading Eusebius's Commentary, and Montfauçon's remarks. I have since had the pleasure of seeing Westfelingius's observations upon this matter, in his notes¹ upon the *Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum*: who, I think, has well confuted Montfauçon's argument; and has some thoughts not very² different from those already insisted on by me. And moreover observes, not only the silence of Eusebius before insisted on, but also the silence of Constantine himself in his letter to Macarius bishop of Jerusalem, recommending to him the care of erecting the designed temple, and the³ silence of the author of the *Itinerary*, who seems to have written in the latter part of the reign of Constantine.

7. Though Constantine expressed himself with so much mildness in the Oration before taken notice of, yet certainly he did not intend to leave the temples to the heathen people, and let them enjoy their worship there. This is inconsistent with some things already transcribed, in the order in which they are mentioned by Eusebius. And afterwards, comparing Constantine with other emperors, he says: They⁴ commanded the temples to be magnificently adorned: he demolished them to

post tot secula restitutionem, reipsa confirmasse resurrectionem Domini nostri. Vales. ad Euseb. De V. C. l. iii. c. 28.

¹ Et qui possunt ea hoc loco intelligi? Loquitur de rebus stupendis, quæ ad Christi sepulchrum & Martyrium sua ætate contigerant. Atqui Martyrium illud nusquam erat, cum ea fierent, quæ evenisse Sulpitius æque alii prodiderunt. &c. Pet. Westfeling. Annot. ad. Itinerar. Hieros. p. 593, 594.

² Equid magis mirabile & stupendum Judæis ac paganis esse poterat, quam Augusti matrem, ejusque exemplum imitatos plures, ad vilem antea & despectum eum locum, ut Christo domino meritum honorem haberent, confluere; mirificis operibus illum exornari; quod quam admirandum utrisque fuerit, ex Orat. de Laudibus Constantin. p. 633, colligas. Id. p. 594.

³ Quam rem & Constan-

tini Imp. in ep. ad Macarium, & Eusebii, in his locis & gestis recensendis versati, silentium adfirmat. ib. p. 593.

⁴ Id vero maximopere demiror, nullam hic de cruce, Helenæ auspiciis inventa, nec ullam de stupendis operibus, ejus virtute & contactu patratis, fieri mentionem. Dicemusne præterire ea scriptorem, qui summa diligentia rumusculos, de locis Hierosolymitanis in vulgus sparfos, collegit? — præsertim cum paucissimis ante ejus in urbem Hierosolymitanam adventum annis facta ferantur. Mihi nihil aliud dici posse videtur, quam ea miracula, & quæ illis arctissime coherent, in urbe eo tempore nondum fuisse audita. ib. p. 593.

⁵ Οἱ μὲν τὰς νέας φιλοτιμίας κοσμεῖν ἐκέλευον· ὁ δὲ ἐκ βατρῶν καθῆρται τῶν αὐτῶν, τὰ μάλιστα παρὰ τοῖς θειοτάτοις πολλὰ ἀξία. V. C. l. iii. c. 1. p. 483. B.

the foundation, especially such as were most respected by superstitious people. Moreover, Constantine ^u made very free with the statues of the gods, taking them out of the temples, and placing them in the forum, and other parts of the city of Constantinople: thereby serving, as the historian says, two ends, both adorning the city, and exposing to contempt those gods whose images they were. And many rich statues of the gods, consisting of gold and silver, were melted down by him.

Our historian has also left us a particular account of the demolishing several heathen temples by Constantine's order, beside the depriving many others of their richest and most respected ornaments: as ^x a temple dedicated to Venus in a grove at Aphæa in Phœnicia. He says, it was a kind of school of lewdness, and all manner of vice, where no grave or modest people came. The emperor ordered it to be totally demolished, which was done by his soldiers. A temple of Æsculapius at Ægis in Cilicia was in like manner destroyed by the military power at the emperor's command. He does not say, that any lewdness was practised here. However, this temple was a means of seducing people, and it was much respected by the philosophers. At ^y one nod of the emperor, as Eusebius says, this celebrated wonder of the egregious philosophers lay flat upon the ground, being pulled down by a band of soldiers. Beside these, there ^z was another temple of Venus, a place of much lewdness, destroyed at Heliopolis in Phœnicia; and a spacious Christian church was erected in the room of it.

And afterwards Eusebius expressly says, that ^a throughout the whole Roman empire, the doors of idolatry were shut to the commonalty and to the soldiery: and that every kind of sacrifice was prohibited. Again, he says, that ^b there were several laws published for these purposes, forbidding sacrifices, divinations, raising statues, and the secret mysteries or rites of initiation. And he says farther, that ^c in Egypt a sort of priesthood, consecrated to the honour of the Nile, was entirely suppressed. And though the heathen people thereupon surmised, that the Nile would no more overflow the fields, it rose the next year very high, and gave them great plenty.

However, it may reasonably be supposed, that the admonitions in the Oration against idolatry were of use to prevent po-

^u ib. l. iii. c. 54.

^x ib. c. 56.

^z c. 58.

^a — Συρίας τε τρι-

^y Ετι δε νευματι καλα γης ηπλητο, δεξια παρ απησερευελο παρ.

V. C. l. iv. c. 23.

καλαρρηπιθμενος γραβωλικη το των γενναιων φιλοσοφων βωμενον θανμα. ibid.

^b c. 25.

^c ib.

ular tumults, and the doing any things of this kind, which were not authorized by the emperor's order.

8. We have likewise an account of Constantine's^d treatment of heretics, after he had composed differences, and restored harmony in the church of God: that is, after the council of Nice.

Our historian says, that^e by a law sent to the presidents of provinces, he dispersed and put to flight all these men. Beside the edict, the emperor gave those people a salutary admonition, exhorting them to repent without delay. This^f edict is directed against the Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulianists, and those called Cataphrygians, and all others, who by private meetings endeavour to support heresies. Here the emperor condemns his past forbearance, as an occasion of men's being seduced by these erroneous people. He therefore threatens to extirpate the roots of evil by a public animadversion. 'Wherefore,' says^g he, 'since this your pernicious wickedness is no longer to be endured, we by this present law command you, that you no more presume to meet together. And we have given orders, that all those places, where you are wont to hold assemblies, should be taken away. Yea, our concern for this matter is such, that we not only forbid you to assemble in any public place; but we likewise forbid all assemblies of your foolish superstition in private houses, and in all private places whatever. All of you therefore, who have any sincere love of truth, come to the catholic church.—And that this remedy may have its full effect, we ordain, that all your superstitious conventicles, I mean oratories of all heretics, if it be fit to call such houses oratories, be forthwith taken away, and without any opposition delivered to the catholic church: and that the rest of your places be adjudged to the public. Thus,' says our ecclesiastical historian, 'the^h dens of heretics were laid open by the imperial edict, and the wild beasts, the ringleaders of their impiety, were scattered.' He adds, thatⁱ in this edict orders were given for searching out their books. The effect of all which was, as the historian says, that some of those heterodox people, being terrified by the emperor's edict, renounced their errors, hypocritically only, and in that manner came into the church, whilst others of them became sincere converts.

^d l. iii. c. 63.—66.

^e ib. c. 63.

νασθαι των ανδρων τας βιβλους διηγοριουν ο νομος. c. 66. ib.

^f c. 64.

^g ib. c. 65.

^h ib. c. 66.

ⁱ Επει δε και διερευ-

This

This edict was published in * 326. Here is no mention made of Arians. The reason of it may be, that their cause had been lately determined, and it was supposed, that sufficient care had been already taken of them: or the reason may be, that there were few who went under that denomination. For Sozomen says, that ¹ though the Arian scheme was much discoursed of, it did not form a separate people, or make a distinct sect in the time of Constantine. Indeed many who held that sentiment, kept their places in the church.

9. I must pass over divers things related by Eusebius, and observe only these following. Constantine ^m constituted a kind of church in his own palace, and with chearfulness led the way to those that assembled there with him. Taking the sacred books in his own hands, he attentively read and meditated upon the divine oracles: and then recited the usual prayers with the whole assembly of his courtiers. These were public prayers. Constantine besides prayed ^a daily in private in his own closet. In time of war he ^e had a tabernacle, or chapel, at a small distance from his camp; in which he used to pray, especially before a battle, for the divine protection and blessing: having at the same time in his company a few of his friends, who were men of known virtue and piety. He ^p taught even his heathen soldiers a form of prayer, in which they worshipped the one true God, praising him for past benefits, and expressing their trust in him for the future; and praying particularly for the safety of the emperor and his family, and the continuance and prosperity of his government. He ordained by an edict, that ^a the Lord's-day should be a day of rest throughout the Roman empire. He ^r was present at divers synods for making up differences between Christians, and earnestly recommended to them peace and friendship. He ^e would converse familiarly with Christian bishops, and make them sit at his table. He ^r was very kind and bountiful to the poor, especially such as fell into want from plentiful circumstances. He ^a likewise made donations of money and lands to many

* Vid. Basnag. Ann. 327. n. 3.

¹ Το δε αρευν δογμα, ει και πολλοις εν τοις διαλεξεσιν εσπεδαζετο, επω εις ιδιον διεκερσιτο λαον, η ονομα τη ευρεσιος. Sozom. l. ii. c. 32. in. Et conf. Basnag. Ann. 326. n. iv. ^m — ως εν αυτοις τοις βασιλειαις εκκλησιας Ον τροπον διεβλε, σπεδη εξαρχων αυτος των ενον εκκλησιαζομενων: μελα χειρας ηβλοι λαμβανων τας βιβλους, τη των διοικητων λογικη διακρια προσ-

ανειχε τον νεν. ελα ευχας ενδισμας εν τοις τον βασιλειον οικον πληρυσιν αποιδου. V. C. l. iv. c. 17. ⁿ ib. c. 22.

^o ib. l. ii. c. 12, 14. ^p l. iv. c. 19, 20. ^q l. iv. c. 18. 23. Vid. & Soz. H. E. l. i. c. 8. p. 412. B. C. & Cod. i. lib. iii. T. 12. l. iii.

^r V. C. l. i. c. 44. ^s ib. l. i. c. 42. ^t ib. c. 43. ^u l. iv. c. 28.

churches,

churches, and certain allowances to poor widows and fatherless children.

By Sozomen we are informed, that * Constantine abolished the punishment of the cross, which had been so long used by the Romans. This edict is also mentioned by † a heathen historian with commendation. It appears to have been a popular act.

He forbad ‡ the cruel sports of gladiators; though his authority was not sufficient to abolish them every where, and entirely. There § was need of repeated laws of Christian emperors for that purpose. He likewise appointed, that ¶ criminals, which had been hitherto usually condemned to act as gladiators in the public shews, should rather be sent to work in the mines.

10. I must not allow myself to give a particular account of all the synods held in his time, nor of all his epistles, edicts, or orations. I have already taken notice of several of them, and I may have occasion to make extracts out of some more. A catalogue of Constantine's epistles and orations may be seen in * Cave, and † Fabricius. Fr. Baudouin, or Balduinus, as we usually call him, wrote ‡ two books concerning this emperor's laws. And there is a kind of list or collection of the titles of his laws in Varenius's Life of Constantine.

V. We may now, I presume, be indulged the liberty of drawing Constantine's character, some outlines of it at least, and of making some few general remarks upon his reign.

Constantine was remarkably tall, † of a comely and majestic presence, and great bodily strength. It may be concluded from the whole tenor of his life, that he was a person of no mean capacity: the achievements and successes of Constantine

* — ἀμείλει τοι σπέρματιν ἐνομισμένον
ἐκείνης τῆς τῆ σαυρὸς τιμωρίας, οὐκ ἂν
αὐτῆς χρῆσις τῶν δικαστηρίων. Sozom.
l. i. c. 8. p. 412. C. † Eo pius, ut
etiam vetus vetustissimumque supplicium pa-
tibilium & crucibus suffringendis primus
removerit. Hinc pro conditore aut deo
creditus. Aur. Vict. Cæs. cap. 41.

‡ — μη μενομαχῶν μεταφρονῶν μολυνῶν
τῆς πόλεως. Euf. de V. C. l. iv. c. 25.

§ Cruenta spectacula in otio civili, &
domestica quiete, non placent. Quapropter
omnino gladiatores esse prohibemus. Cod.
l. i. xi. t. 43. 1.

¶ Cruenta spectacula in otio civili, & domestica quiete,
non placent. Quapropter qui omnino
gladiatores esse prohibemus, eos qui forte
delictorum causa hanc conditionem atque

sententiam mereri consueverant, metallo
magis facies inservire, ut sine sanguine su-
orum scelerum pœnas agnoscant. Cod.
Th. T. v. p. 395. † H. L. T. i.
p. 184, 185.

‡ Bib. Gr. T. vi. p.
2.—7. & Lux Evangelii. p. 273.—294.

§ Fr. Balduini Constantinus Magnus:
sive Commentariorum de Constantini Imp.
Legibus ecclesiasticis & civilibus. Libri
duo. Lipsiæ. 1727.

† — το,
τ' ἄλλο εἶδος το μετῆος τι υπερβαλλον
μεν τῆς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἀπαίτας, τῇ τι καλλεῖ
τῆς ὥρας, καὶ τῇ μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ τῆς τῆ σω-
μαίος εὐπρεπείας, ἀλλὰ τι ῥωμαῖς ἀμαχί-
κῃ. Euf. De V. C. l. iii. c. 10. p. 488.
C. D. Vid. & l. i. c. 19. & de Mort.
Perf. c. 18.

do not belong to men of weak and irresolute minds. Indeed, his ^k mind was equal to his fortune, great as it was. His escape from Galerius to his father Constantius, is a proof of considerable sagacity, forecast, and circumspection: his valour had been tried and approved more than once ^h in his youth, and was conspicuous on all proper occasions throughout his whole life: his ⁱ chastity, together with his valour, justice, and prudence, is commended by a heathen panegyrist: his many acts of bounty to the poor, and his just edicts, are arguments of a merciful disposition, and a love of justice: he was moreover a sincere believer of the Christian religion, of which he first of all the Roman emperors made an open profession.

He is taxed by a heathen historian ^k with ambition and prodigality. He owns, however, that these are the faults of great minds: which if Constantine had escaped, he would have been perfect.

Praxagoras, a heathen author, native of Athens, who, beside other works, wrote a ^l History of Constantine, in two books, says, that ^m this emperor surpassed all his predecessors in all virtue and goodness, and in the felicity of his reign.

VI. Having observed these virtues of Constantine, and other things, which are to his advantage; a just respect to truth obligeth us to take notice of some other things, which seem to cast a reflection upon him.

Among these, one of the chief is his putting to death so many of his relations: as Maximian Herculus, his wife's father; Bassianus, husband of his sister Anastasia; Crispus, his

^{*} Innumeras in eo animi corporisque virtutes claruerunt, militaris gloriæ appetentissimus: fortuna in bellis prospera fuit: verum ita, ut non superaret industriam. Eutrop. Brev. l. x. n. 7.

Constantio quoque filius erat Constantinus, sanctissimus adolescens, & illo fastigio dignissimus, qui insigni & decore habitu corporis, & industria militari, & probis moribus, & comitate singulari, a militibus amaretur, a privatis & optaretur. De M. P. c. 18.

^h Fortitudinem autem illius [Constantii patris] jam tum in principis consecutus es. Paneg. vi. n. 4.

ⁱ Neque enim forma tantum in te patris, Constantine, sed etiam continentia, fortitudo, justitia, prudentia sese votis gentium presentant. Quo enim magis continentiam patris æquare potuisti, quam quod te ab ipso sine pueritiæ illico matrimonii legibus tradidisti, ut primo ingressu adolescentiæ formares animum ma-

ritalem, nihil de vagis cupiditatibus, nihil de concessis ætati voluptatibus in hoc sacrum pectus admitteres: novum tum miraculum, juvenis uxorius. Paneg. vi. n. 3, 4.

^k At memoria mea Constantinum, quamquam cæteris promptum virtutibus, ad utrumque alitra votis omnium subvexere. Qui profecto, si munificentia atque ambitionis modum, hisque artibus statuisset, quibus præcipue adulta ingenia gloriæ studio progressa longius in contrarium labuntur, haud multum obesset deo. Aur. Viâ. Cæf. cap. 40.

Fuit vero ultra quam æstimari potest, laudis avidus. Viâ. Epit. c. 41.

^l Πραξαγόρη τοῦ ἀθηναίου τῆς κατὰ τοὺς μὲν Ἰαν. Κωνσταντίνου ιστορίας βιβλία δύο. Phot. Cod. 62. p. 64. in.

^m Καὶ οὕτως τῆς δημοκρατίας ἐλλείπον, ὅτι παστὴ ἀρετὴ καὶ καλοκαταβολαί, καὶ πασὶν εὐτυχημαὶ πασῶν προ αὐτοῦ βεβασιλευκότος ο βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντίνος ἀπεκρυσταλ. ib. p. 65.

own son; Fausta, his wife; Licinius, husband of his sister Constantia; and Licinianus, or Licinius the younger, his nephew, and son of the fore-mentioned Licinius.

To some of these actions Constantine was reduced by a hard necessity, arising from the treacherous conduct of his relations, in which therefore he is generally justified. For the rest he is blamed, especially some of the last; which is one reason, why the latter part of his reign is not reckoned equal to the former part of it.

The death of Maximian in 310, has escaped in a manner all censure. It was partly a just punishment for past crimes, and partly a necessary defence against future dangerous designs, and attempts.

In 314 or 315, Constantine put to death Bassianus, to whom he had married his sister Anastasia. We have no very particular account of this matter; but it is said, that Constantine had discovered, that Licinius had set Bassianus against him, by means of Senecion, brother of the same Bassianus, at the time that the emperor was designing favours for him.

In 325, Licinius was put to death at Thessalonica, after that Constantine had reduced him to a private condition, and promised him his life. This action is censured not only by Zozimus, but by others also, as contrary to the promise which Constantine had made him, of preserving his life. On the other hand, some attempt to justify it, upon account of bad designs, actually formed by Licinius; or to excuse it, by

Verum insolentia rerum secundarum aliquantum Constantinum ex illa favorabili animi docilitate mutavit. Primum necessitudines persecutus, egregium virum, & sororis filium, commodæ indolis juvenem, interfecit; mox uxorem; post, numerosos amicos. Vir primo imperii tempore optimis principibus, ultimo mediis comparandus. Eutrop. l. x. c. 6, 7. Cumque specie officii, dolis compositis [Heraculus], Constantinum generum tentaret acerbe, jure tandem interierat. Aur. Vict. Cels. c. 40.

Molens tamen Constantinum, reperta occasione, interficere. — Detectis igitur insidias per Faustam filiam, quæ dolum viro enuntiaverat, — poenam dedit justissimo exitu. Eutrop. l. x. cap. 3. Et vid. omnino De M. P. c. 30.

See Tillem. Constantin. art. 36.

Post aliquantum deinde temporis Constantium Constantinus ad Licinium misit, persuadens ut Bassianus Cæsar fieret, qui

habebat alteram Constantini sororem Anastasiam; ut exemplo Diocletiani & Maximiani inter Constantinum & Licinium Bassianus Italiam medius obtineret. Et Licinio talia frustrante, per Senecionem Bassiani fratrem, qui Licinio fidus erat, in Constantinum Bassianus armatur. Qui tamen in conatu deprehensus, Constantino jubente, convictus & stratus est. Anon. Vales. p. 713. Vid. Basn. Ann. 325. n. 3. Pagi. 318. n. 7, 8. & 324. n. 3.

Λικίνιος δὲ εἰς τὴν Θεσσαλονικὴν ἐκτεμνέας ὡς βίωσκειν αὐτοῖς συν ασφαλείᾳ, μετ' ἡ πόλιν τῆς ὁρκῆς πάλιν (ὅτι γὰρ τὸ αὐτῶν συνθεῖς) ἀσχονή αὐτοῖς τὴν ἐν ἀφαιρέσει. Zof. l. ii. p. 685. Licinius

Thessalonica: contra jus sacramenti privatus occiditur. Hieron. Chr. p. 181.

Postremo Licinius navali & terrestri prælio victus apud Nicomediam se dedit, & contra religionem sacramenti Thessalonica: privatus occisus est. Eutrop. l. x. c. 6.

Socrat. l. i. c. 4.

Sed Hercu-

the

the apprehensions of designs to resume the purple, and create disturbances, contrary to engagements. By some this matter is ¹ past by, or ² just mentioned, without either censure or apology. Basnage argues, that ³ there can be no good foundation for the defence made by Socrates, forasmuch as Eusebius says nothing of Licinius having attempted any disturbances after his last defeat. Indeed it is observable, that so many ancient writers charge Constantine with breach of faith in this matter. Nor is it strange, that some should omit to pass any censure upon this action, considering ⁴ the cruelty, avarice, and other vices of Licinius; who had in him few agreeable or commendable qualities, beside his being a good general, and a lover of military discipline.

In 326, ⁵ Constantine put to death his son Crispus, and his nephew Licinianus, or the younger Licinius, who had been ⁶ Cæsars ever since the year ⁷ 317. Crispus had been consul likewise in 318, 321, and 324, and Licinianus in 319.

Crispus, son of Constantine by Minervina, was now at least 25 ⁸ years of age, a person of great qualifications, who had been serviceable to his father in the wars with ⁹ the Franks, and

iii Maximiani foci motus exemplo, ne iterum depositam purpuram in perniciem reipublicæ fumeret, privatum iussit occidi. Oros. l. vii. c. 28. Conf. Anon. Vales. p. 715. in.

y Itaque Sexennio post rupta pace apud Thracas, Licinius pulsus Chalcedona concessit. Ibi ad auxilium sui Martiniano in imperium ceptato, una oppressus est. Aur. Vict. Cæs. c. 41.

z Dehinc Constantinus acie potior apud Bithyniam adegit Licinium, pacta salute, indumentum regium offerre per uxorem. Inde Thessalonicam missum, paullo post eum Martinianumque jugulari jubet. Hic Licinius annum dominationis fere post quintum decimum, vitæ proxime sexagesimum, occiditur. Victor. Epit. c. 41.

a Vellemus quidem ea rebellione omni labe Constantinianam innocentiam liberari. Verum enimvero creditu difficillimum est, Licinium ad privatam fortunam redactum in bellum confurrexisse, quam Licinii perfidiam Eusebius non præterisset. Basn. 325. n. 3.

b — ob diversos mores tamen anxie triennium congruere quivere. Namque illi præter modum magnificentia, huic parsimonia, & ea quidem agrestis, tantummodo inerat. Denique Constantius cunctos hostes honore ac fortunis manentibus texit, recepitque. — Licinio ne insonitum quidem ac nobilium philosophorum servili more cruciatus adhibiti modum se-

cere. Aur. Vict. de Cæsar. c. 41.

Avaritiæ cupidine omnium pessimus, neque alienus a luxu venerio, asper admodum haud mediocriter impatiens: infestus literis, quas per inficitiam immodicam virus ac pestem publicam nominabat, præcipue forenses industriam. Agrariis plane ac rusticantibus, quia de eo genere ortus altusque erat, satis utilis, ac militiæ custos ad veterum instituta severissimus. Vict. Epit. c. 41. Vid. & Euseb. H. E. l. x. c. 8. p. 396, 397. De V. C. l. i. c. 55.

c Vid. Pagi. 324. n. 3, 4. 325. n. 48. Basn. 326. n. 1, 2. d Crispus & Constantinus filii Constantini, & Licinius adolescens, Licinii Augusti filius, Constantini ex sorore nepos, Cæsares appellantur. Euseb. Chron. p. 180.

Filiumque suum Crispum nomine, ex Minervina concubina susceptum, item Constantinum, iisdem diebus natum opido Arelatensi, Licinianumque Licinii filium, mensium fere viginti, Cæsares effecit. Vict. Epit. c. 41.

Vid. & Vict. de Cæsar. c. 41. Idat. Fall. Conf. Zof. l. ii. p. 679. f. Anon. Vales. p. 713. f.

e Vid. Pagi. Ann. 315. n. 3. 317. n. 2. Basn. 317. n. i.

f See Tillem. in

Constantin. Art. 41. 62.

g Declarant

ecce rationem cupiditatemque votorum

facta Crispi Cæsarium Maximi, in quo ve-

with

with ^a Licinius. Many historians relate ¹ the unhappy end of this young prince. The silence of Eusebius is reckoned very remarkable: in his Ecclesiastical History he commends Crispus; in ^b his Life of Constantine, written several years after, as ^c Tillemont observes, he repeats the same matters almost word for word, but leaves out all he had said of Crispus: and though he relates at length Constantine's victory over Licinius, in which Crispus had a large share, as he himself had related in the History, he does not now so much as name him. These silences and omissions, as the same diligent and accurate writer farther adds, speak a great deal. For Eusebius would have excused this thing, if he had been able; but he saw no other method he could take, but to pass it by in utter silence: choosing rather to expose himself to the charge of violating the laws of history, than to undertake to justify what all the world condemned.

The death of Crispus is ascribed by some historians ^m to the calumnies of Fausta. Zozimus's account is, that ⁿ he was accused of criminal conversation with Fausta, or of attempting it. Gregory of Tours makes ^o the crime he was charged with to be rebellion; in which charge he supposes Fausta to have been joined with him. Some historians ^p do not seem to know the reason of his death; which ignorance, or suspense, possibly,

Lux virtutis ætatisq; mora non retardata pueriles annos gloriis triumphalibus occupavit.
^{&c.} Paneg. x. c. 36. Vid. & c. 37.

^b Constantinus Cæsarem Crispum cum grandi classe ad occupandam Asiam miserat. — Crispus vero cum classe Constantini Callipolim pervenit, ubi bello maritimo sic Amandum vicit, ut vix per eos, qui in litore permanferant, vivus Amandus efflueret. — Anon. Valef. p. 714. Vid. & Euseb. H. E. l. x. c. 9. ⁱ His Consulibus occisus & Crispus, & edidit vicenaria Constantinus Augustus Romæ. Idat. Fast.

Ad Istriam duxit prope opidum Polam, ubi quondam diremptum Constantini filium accepimus Crispum. Ammian. M. l. xiv. c. 11. p. 63.

— ut mihi non figuratius Constantini domum vitamque videatur vel pupugisse versu gemello Consul Ablabius, vel mordisse, disticho tali clam palatinis foribus appenso:

Saturni aurea sæcla quis requirât?

Sunt hæc gemmea, sed Neroniana.

Quia scilicet prædictus Augustus iisdem tere temporibus exstinxerat Faustam calore balnei, filium Crispum frigore veneni.

Apol. Sidon. l. v. ep. 8.

^k Conf. H. E. l. x. c. 9. & De V. C. l. ii. c. 19. ^l Constantine, Art. 62.

^m Οὗ φησι τὸν Κωνσταντῖνον ἀνελαι τὸν ἰδίον παῖδα, διαβόλαις τῆς μητρὸς συναρπασθῆναι. Philost. l. ii. c. 4.

At Constantinus, obtento totius Romani imperii, mira bellorum felicitate, regimine, Fausta conjuge, ut putant, suggerente, Crispum filium necari jubet. Vict. Epit. c. 41.

ⁿ Κρίσπος γὰρ παῖδα, τῆς τῆς καίσαρος (ὡς εἰρηλαί πρὸς τὸν) ἀξιοθεύλα τιμῆς, ἐς υποψίαν ἐλθοῦσα τῇ Φαυστῇ τῇ μητρὶ συναίρει. — αὐτὴ. Zof. l. ii. p. 685. m.

^o Hic Constantinus anno vicesimo imperii sui Crispum filium veneno, Faustam conjugem calente balneo interfecit: scilicet, quod proditores regni ejus voluissent. Gr. T. Hist. Fr. l. i. c. 36. ^p Quorum cum natu grandior, incertum qua causa, patriis iudicio occidisset. Vict. de Cæsar. c. 41.

Sed inter hæc latent cause, cur vindicem gladium, & destinatam in impios punitio-nem, Constantinus imperator etiam in proprios egit affectus. Nam Crispum filium suum, & Licinium sororis filium, interfecit. Oros. l. vii. c. 28.

may

may be ascribed to a respect for Constantine himself, or the reigning emperor, in whose time they wrote. Jerom, in an addition, inserted by him in Eusebius's Chronicle, condemns both the death of Crispus and Licinianus. 'In⁹ this year,' says he, 'Crispus, son of Constantine, and Licinius the younger, son of Licinius and Constantine's sister Constantia, are most cruelly put to death, in the ninth year of their empire;' that is, their Cæsarean empire.

The younger Licinius could not then be more than a little above eleven years of age, if so much: he^r is also spoken of as a hopeful youth; and St. Jerom, in the passage just cited, calls his death, as well as that of Crispus, a cruel action.

Next comes Fausta, not long after the two last. Zozimus says, that^s Helena being extremely grieved for the death of Crispus, excited Constantine to revenge it on Fausta, the adviser of it. There is much the same account^t in Victor's Epitome. Fausta, however, is accused by some of adultery with a very mean person: but that account does not appear well founded.

These are the executions, which above all others cast a reflection upon the reign of Constantine; though there are also hints of the death of some others about the same time, with whom Constantine had till then lived in friendship.

I do by no means think, that Constantine was a man of a cruel disposition; and therefore I am unwilling to touch upon any other actions of a like nature: as^x his making some German princes taken captive fight in the theatre, and sending the head^y of Maxentius to Africa, after it had been made^z a part of Constantine's triumphal entry at Rome.

At the time of the first affair Constantine was not a Christian; and but newly converted at the time of the other. These

⁹ Crispus filius Constantini, Licinius junior, Constantiæ sororis & Licinii filius, crudelissime interficiuntur anno imperii sui nono. Euf. Chron. p. 181.

^r Primum necessitudines persecutus, Crispum filium, egregium virum, & sororis filium, commodæ indolis juvenem, interfecit, mox uxorem, post numerosos amicos. Eutrop. l. x. c. 6.

^s Τῆς δὲ Κωνσταντίνου μητρὸς εὐχῆς ἐπὶ τῷ τηλικαύῳ πατρὶ δυσχεραίνουσας, καὶ ἀσχελῶς τὴν ἀκαιρεσίᾳ τῇ νῦν φερούσας, κακῶ τὸ κακὸν ἰατὰλο μίζον· βαλάνειον γὰρ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μίσρον ἐκπυρῶσθαι κελεύσας καὶ τῷ τῇ Φαύστῃ ἐναποδομένῳ, ἐξηλάσε νεκρὰν γενομένην. Zof. l. ii. p. 685.

^t Dehinc uxorem Faustam in balneas ardentes coniectam interemit, cum eum ma-

ter Helena dolore nimio nepotis increparet. Vict. Epit. c. 41.

^u Κακῶς δὲ πάλιν φωραθεὶσαν τῇ τῶν κερσίων μοιχευμένη, τῇ τῇ λυσιᾷ ἀλλὰ ἀποπνίγειν προσάγει. Philost. l. ii. c. 4.

^x Puberes, qui in manu venerunt, quorum nec perfidia erat apta militia, nec ferocia servituti, ad penas spectaculo dati sævientes bestias multitudine sua fatigarunt. Paneg. vii. c. 19.

^y Pari studio missum ejusdem tyranni ad permulcendam Africam caput, ut quam maxime vivus afflixerat, laceratus expleret. Nazar. Paneg. 10. c. 32.

^z Sequabatur hunc comitatum suum tyranni ipsius teterrimum caput.—Injiciebantur vulgo contumeliosissimæ voces. Id. cap. 31.

things too, may receive an excuse from the custom of those times, and the necessity of some outward severity at the beginning of a reign, the better to settle it, and to deter from farther attempts. The Franks or Germans had been guilty of breach of faith, and therefore were punished for a perfidiousness. And, by the confession of Zosimus^b himself, Constantine used his victory over Maxentius mercifully, and did no more than was necessary for his own and the public security.

As for the deaths of his relations, of which a distinct account has been given, that of Maximian, as before observed, seems a clear case; that of Bassianus lies in obscurity: of the four last, the death of Licinius also is doubtful. And what cause of displeasure there might be against Fausta, we cannot certainly say: one might be apt to suspect, that she had been guilty of unfaithfulness to the emperor's bed, or else had greatly deceived him with regard to Crispus, or some other matter of high importance. And yet it must be owned, that Zozimus^c does not approve of her death; and says, that Constantine did not mend the matter, by adding one crime to another. And Apollinarius Sidonius reckons^d the death of Fausta, as well as of Crispus, among Constantine's cruel actions. The death of Crispus is altogether without any good excuse: so likewise is the death of the young Licinius, who appears not to have been charged with any fault, and can hardly be suspected of any.

In order to judge of the general causes of these last executions, I think it worthy of observation, that they all happened very near to one another; when Constantine was come, as it were, to the top of his fortune, and was in the greatest prosperity. And both ^e Zozimus and ^f Eutropius mention the pride of his successes, as the cause and spring of these bad actions. Here then lies the general excuse, or alleviation of these faults. Prosperity is a dangerous state, full of temptation, and puts men off their guard. Now also, it is likely, Constantine was thinking how to secure the empire in his family, and perpetuate the quiet possession of it, free from disturbances. For this end, and with this view, he might be too much inclined to cut off both Licinius and his son. And possibly, on the like account, was too susceptible of impressions

^a Vid supra not. x. ^b Ο Κωνσταντίνος οὐδὲν μὲν τοῖς τῶν ἐπιηδυσίων Μαξιμιανὸν ὀκνῶν ἐπέθηκε. κ. λ. Zof. l. ii. p. 677.

^c Vid. supr. not. x. ^d See before

p. 175. ^e Ἐπὶ δ' εἰς τὴν ῥωμῆν ἀφ' αὐτοῦ μέγας πάσης ἀλαζονείας, ἀφ' ἧς

αὐτὸν διὰν ἀρξασθαι τῆς ἀσέβειας· Κρίστον γὰρ παῖδα. κ. λ. Zof. l. ii. p. 685.

^f Verum insolentia rerum secundarum aliquantum Constantinum ex illa favorabili animi docilitate mutavit. Primum necessitudines persecutus, &c. Eutrop. l. x. c. 6.

from Fausta; who for the same reasons, that Constantine was desirous to secure the empire in his own family, was also concerned to secure it to his issue by her.

Empire is esteemed a precious jewel; many are catching at it; and they who are possessed of it, are sensible of as much, which causeth troublesome and exorbitant jealousy. It is to be feared, that this occasioned the death of Licinius, both father and son; and possibly had, some way or other, an influence in the death of Crispus.

We should however be willing to make allowances in favour of princes, and especially of long reigns. It is next to impossible, for human wisdom and discretion, in the course of many years filled with action, not to be surprized into some injustice, through the bias of affection, or the specious suggestions of artful and designing people. Though, therefore, there may have been some transactions in this reign, which cannot be easily justified, and others that must be condemned; yet we are not to consider Constantine as a cruel prince, or a bad (1) man.

Upon the whole, the highest stations of life are not so desirable as we imagine; the happiness of them does not com-

(1) Some have been very severe in their censures of Constantine. They who desire to see an instance of this, may read *Observat. Hallens.* xxiv. *Fabulæ de Constantino M. & potissimum de ejus Christianismo.* Others have passed a favourable judgment upon him. Nor have they scrupled to make an apology for those parts of his conduct, which are not unexceptionable. Among these latter are Balduin. de Legib. Constantini M. and Vitringa upon the Apocalypse. From this last I shall transcribe some observations. Fuitque vere Constantinus talis, qualis hic pingitur, vir fortis, & non minus decore corporis habitu, quam animi magnitudine & virtute insignis. Vitring. in Apoc. c. 12. ver. 1—6. n. ii. p. 705. in. Fateor enim me, non videre quæ justa causa moveat Christianæ professionis homines, cur tam inclementer de hoc Principe judicent, in quo Eutropius, ipse Paganus homo, ejusque memorie, ut constat, minus favens, innumeras animi corporisque virtutes claruisse, agnoscit. Id. n. iii. p. 710. Cætera autem quod attinet, si inter se comparemus, & æqua libremus lance, quæ ab hac parte Panegyrici, Eusebius & Eumenius, in ejus laudem, ab altera obrectatores famæ ejus, Julianus & Zosimus, in ejus vituperium scripserunt, longe hic Princeps major erit virtutibus, quam vitiis. Fuerit enim supra modum munificus, laudis amans, & quæ-

que, quod negare nolim, plus quibusdam casibus tribuens & fidens amicis, quam sepe prudentia suadet: quæ vitia in tanti imperii & potestatis Principe non sunt ex maximis: cætera Imperatorem præstitit optimum & laudatissimum, elegantiam omnis & literarum non patronum tantum sed & cultorem. Quod enim sevitie quoque & crudelitatis ipsi inuratur macula, calumnia est, quam ad memoriam Principis dehonestandum livor produxit Paganorum. Certe quæ Zosimus tam de hoc vitio, quam de profusa ejus liberalitate & avaritia scripsit, ex invidia & odio hujus Principis ab homine Pagano vel maligne fida, vel in majus aucta esse, æquo & veri amanti lectori facile pater. Quæ enim de Crispi & Faustæ conjugis nece habet ille, non tam arguunt Constantini malitiam crudelitatemque, quam illius imprudentiam, qua factum, ut falsis accusationibus Faustæ conjugis—facilem nimis præbuerit aurem: quæ postquam detectæ fuerint, quis miretur, tantum justo dedisse dolori, ut ab ea exegerit vindictam?—Certe si hoc vitium in principe regnasset, non pauca, sed plurima exempla conservata essent in historia, quæ spatio triginta & amplius annorum, quo summa imperii penes ipsum fuit, condidisset. Nec neglexissent Gentiles, iniqui omnes hujus memorie Principis, eadem ad obscurandam ejus laudem committere poterant. Ib. n. iv. p. 712, 713.

penfate for all their care and toil; and for all those actions neceffary to keep them, which are not confiftent with innocence. Great men are rather to be pitied than envied. They however, who fteadily purfue the good of thofe who are fubject to them, will have a great reward for all their labour and care, and attention to government: they are intitled to the higheft honours from men, and fhall receive a yet greater reward from God, the beft friend and trueft lover of mankind.

VII. If we proceed to confider the treatment of men under this reign, according to their different religious diftinctions and denominations, catholic, heretic, and heathen, we fhall obferve feveral things liable to exception.

The unequal treatment of catholics and heretics, foon after the firft ceafing of the perfecution and the opening of liberty to the profefors of the Chriftian religion, is not to be juftified in point of religion or policy. We do not lay all the blame of this upon Conftantine. If there be any fault, it will partly fall upon the Chriftians, both minifters and others, with whom he advifed. But it feems, that Conftantine fhould not have made himfelf a party with any of the fefts, into which the Chriftian profefion was then divided. It was fit, that as they had all fuffered in the late perfecution, fo they fhould all fhare in the liberty now granted. If any, whether catholics or others, were not contented with enjoying equal rights and privileges together with their brethren, fellow-creatures, fellow-fufferers, and fellow-fubjects, they were unreafonable men, and fhewed, that they were not to be humoured.

The following treatment of thofe called heretics, when Conftantine's government was more firmly eftablifhed, was ftill more fevere, and confequently more unreafonable, than the unequal regards to Cæcilian and his party, and the Donatifts in Africa. For then, as Eufebius has affured us, the private affemblies of all heretics, Valentinians, Marcionites, Cataphrygians, and others, were prohibited.

It is furprizing, that our ecclefiaftical hiftorian fhould relate thefe things with fuch manifelt tokens of approbation and fatisfaction. According to that edict, Tertullian, who in the time of the emperor Severus publifhed fo noble an apology for the Chriftian religion and its profefors, could not have had liberty of public worfhip under a Chriftian emperor: no, according to law, he could not now, any more than in his own time, have joined with his friends in the worfhip of God, in the moft private place whatever. In fhort, liberty was ftill given to thofe only, who were of the emperor's religion: and

little regard was had for those, who preserved a supreme reverence for him, who is King of kings, Emperor of all emperors, Sovereign Lord of the whole world, and Judge of the thoughts, reasonings, and determinations, as well as the outward actions of his rational and intelligent creatures. Certainly, there remains a rest for the people of God; there is a future recompense in another world for the strictly and inflexibly virtuous of all denominations. For in this world they scarce ever have security and protection; but under almost all governments, without any offence whatever against the state, they are treated as impious, profane, and disaffected.

It cannot be reckoned strange, that in this place, and upon occasion of this partiality toward Christians by the first Christian emperor, I freely deliver my thoughts upon it, considering the sad influence of this precedent: and that in consequence of it, and the principle from which it proceeded, not long after this, sometimes Arians, sometimes Homousians, were under persecution, and all its penalties: or else were advanced, without respect to virtue, only in regard to external agreement of opinion and denomination, to the great prejudice of true religion and virtue, in every age from that time to this.

The several laws of Constantine against heathens are not to be justified. How should Constantine have a right to prohibit all his subjects to sacrifice, and worship at the temples? Would he have liked this treatment, if some other prince had become a Christian at that time, and he still remained a heathen? What reason had he to think, that all men received light and conviction when he did? And if they were not convinced, how could he expect that they should act as he acted?

Now also the Christians, with whom Constantine advised, come into a share of blame with him. It may be said, indeed, that the heathen people had given the Christians great provocation by their former terrible persecutions. But did not every Christian know, that they ought to forgive injuries? and that they should not return evil for evil? And had not they pleaded a right to worship God according to their consciences, though the rest of the world around them were of a different sentiment?

It may be again said, that the Christians, or this Christian emperor, did not put men to death for heathenism: but this is no sufficient apology. It would have been strange, beyond all instances of insatiation, if the Christians had returned all the tortures which they had suffered. But indeed, the lesser degree of persecution is but a small honour to the Christian virtue. For whatever was their inclination, it could not be prudent

prudent to exasperate the heathens at first by laws of the utmost severity. But it seems, that as Constantine's government, and the Christian profession, were established, the severity of the laws against the heathen people increased.

A prince has the advantage of a right to do many things for the service of truth and virtue. He can protect men in detecting and exposing frauds. He may prohibit nocturnal, and all secret, clandestine assemblies, and may require men to perform their religious rites by day-light, and in public view, with their temple doors open. He has the right and power of punishing evil-doers of all sorts, and of restraining and punishing all actions injurious to particular persons, or contrary to good manners, and the peace of society in general. He can protect and defend peaceable, innocent men, in their several civil employments, and in their pursuits of truth, and the profession of the principles of religious or philosophic science. Nor have any like him ability to reward and encourage the virtuous and the skilful. All this is the high privilege of those, whom divine providence intrusts with the reins of civil government: and he who improves this prerogative to the utmost, without exceeding its due bounds and limits, must be an amiable and glorious character. And if this kind of government had obtained, and been thankfully received and heartily approved and applauded by Christian people for some ages, I cannot but think, that the religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ would have been before now, the universal religion of mankind.

All those things before-mentioned, a supreme magistrate has a right to do: but for a prince to pull down men's temples, where nothing is done contrary to the peace of society, to deprive them of their statues and other consecrated ornaments, and to forbid them to worship in the way they approve, and that under heavy penalties: what is this but to vindicate, so far as he is able by his conduct, all instances of persecution in times past? and to encourage and excite to the like injustice in time to come, all princes and emperors toward such as differ from them: and, as it may happen, those of his own religion?

As the late Mr. Le Clerc said, 'They' that continued heathens, were no doubt extremely shocked, at the manner in which the statues of their gods were treated; and could not consider the Christians as men of moderation. For, in short, those statues were as dear to them, as any thing the most sacred could be to the Christians.'

And, as the same learned and judicious writer says in another place, speaking of the Christians below the period we are in, (as was also the former observation): ‘Thus^h the Christians went on, returning to the heathens what they had suffered from them, during the first three centuries; instead of gaining them by the patience and gentleness, which they had so much taught and recommended, when they were the undermost.’

It is not a little surprizing, that Eusebius should triumph over the philosophers, as he does, upon Constantine’s soldiers pulling down a temple of Æsculapius, without being hindered by that pretended deity. Had not Eusebius often heard with his own ears, and read in the history of ancient martyrs, the insults and triumphs of the heathens over the Christians? that they professed themselves the worshippers of the great, and only true God, and yet every body, that pleased, was able to molest and destroy them, as he saw good?

To use the words of bishop Burnet, ‘Itⁱ has been often observed, that though a plea for moderation is the sanctuary of all the unfortunate, yet their fortunes come no sooner to be changed, but they insensibly get into that principle, which was so much decried by themselves, when their affairs were in an ill condition: as if the only quarrel they had with persecution was, that they had not the managing of it themselves.’

How different is this conduct from the principles and sentiments recommended by Lactantius, near the end of the last heathen general persecution, which the Christians suffered! whose argument upon this head was at large shewn by us some time^k ago.

And how deplorable was the consequence! The two prevailing evils of this reign; as^l Eusebius owns, were avarice and hypocrisy. And for certain, authority and force in matters of a religious nature, will multiply hypocrites.

Thus I have shewn, that in the time of this first Christian emperor, there was a treatment given to many people, which was not agreeable to strict justice, nor honourable to the Christian religion.

Besides, it is likely, that a more equal treatment and protection of all sorts of people, who were quiet and peaceable, without regarding their several speculative religious sentiments

^h Bibl. ch. T. 8. p. 276.

ⁱ Preface to the book Of the Deaths of Persecutors, p. 10.

^k See p. 52—56.

^l Και γαρ ην αληθως, δυο χαλιστα ταυτα κατα της δηλημιως χροως και αυλοι και-

ροησαμεν—ειρηνας τ’ αλις τοι την εκκλησιαν υποδυμεν, και το χριστιανω επιπλავως σχημαλιζομεν—ομοια. De V. C. l. iv. c. 34.

or opinions, would have been more for the peace of the emperor's government; and he would also have set an example, that might have been of great use to Christian governments in time to come.

In a word, the conversion of Constantine to Christianity was a favour of divine providence, and of great advantage to the Christians: and his reign may be reckoned a blessing to the Roman empire upon the whole. But there is nothing perfect in this world: oftentimes advantages are not duly improved; and changes for the better do not fully answer expectations, nor turn out to all the account that might have been wished.

From what has been seen and observed by us, it appears, that the happiness of this reign was not equal to all. The heathens had not liberty of worship; for they were forbidden to sacrifice, and all their temples were shut up, which must have been exceeding grievous to them. From the beginning of the liberty to the Christians, some of them too felt the disagreeable effects of partiality. And the severity toward heretics increased: at length these measures incommoded by turns the Homousians and the Arians.

There was still one thing more, which somewhat damped the universal joy of the Christians upon the conversion of Constantine, and lessened the benefit they expected from it. For the particular affection which the Christians in general had for Constantine, was one ground of the persecution raised against them by Licinius. Some of the Christian churches were pulled down or shut up by his order, that men might not meet there for their usual worship. 'For,' says ^m Eusebius, 'he, who gave this order, did not think the prayers there offered were for him, being conscious of his own wickedness. But he thought, we did all for Constantine, and prayed for his prosperity only.'

Nay the uncommon affection of the Christians for Constantine, or the suspicion of it, was prejudicial to them without the bounds of the Roman empire. It is disputed, when the persecution in Persia began: some place the rise of it in ⁿ the year 343, or 344, under Constantius. But Asselman thinks it began in the year 330, and argues very plausibly ^p from Sy-

^m Συνελθόντες γὰρ ἐκ ἡσίου ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ταῖς οὐρανίου ἀποστολῶν συνουσίᾳ παύλα τοιοῦτον ἐποίησαν: ὅτι καὶ Κωνσταντῖνον ἀπαρτίως παύλα ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀποδοῦναι σέβοντο. Euf. V. C. l. ii. c. 2. p. 443. D.

ⁿ Vid. Pagi. 343. n. 3, 4. & Baln. 344. n. 2, 3.

^p Hæc autem persecutio

cepit sub Sapore anno Christi 330, ut in S. Simeone Barseboë statuimus, duravitque annis 40, ut in Actis Martyrum habetur, nimirum usque ad annum 370. Asselman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 183.

^p Vid. eund.

ib. p. 4—9.

rian, and other authors. Petavius^a was of the same opinion, as Asseman also observes. Eusebius has inserted in the Life of Constantine^r a letter, which that emperor sent to Sapor upon that occasion, as it seems. Theodoret^s too, has a copy of it from him. And Sozomen likewise^t, gives a particular account of it. Whatever was the time of this persecution, a notion that the^u Christians in Persia favoured the Roman empire, (either under Constantine or Constantius), was one pretence for it. Whether the Christians gave any just ground for such a suspicion or charge, we cannot certainly say. But if they did, they were to blame: for the Christian religion teaches men to be faithful subjects of the government under which they live, and by which they are protected. Possibly, that charge against the Persian Christians had no other foundation, but the suspicions, or pretences and insinuations of ambitious and artful, or bigotted and prejudiced men; who had some private ends to serve, or mean passion to gratify thereby. But if Constantine, or his successor, had protected the heathens, as well as the Christians, in his empire, I think, he might have sent the king of Persia more forcible and effectual remonstrances against that dreadful persecution, than he did.

VIII. I proceed to observe Constantine's testimony to the scriptures.

1. Eusebius, giving an account of Constantine's conversion, says, 'From^x that time he resolved to give himself to the^y reading of the divine scriptures.'

2. We saw before, in a passage already cited, 'that' Constantine had a kind of church in his own palace, and with 'cheerfulness led the way to those that assembled there with him. Taking the sacred books in his own hands, he attentively read and meditated upon the divine oracles.'

3. Our historian drawing a comparison between former emperors and Constantine, says, 'They^z ordered the divine oracles to be burned: he gave directions for multiplying copies of them, and for magnificently adorning them at the expense of the imperial treasury.'

Whether this be something different from what is to be presently taken notice of, or the same with it, I cannot certainly say.

^a Petav. Rat. Temp. Part i. l. vi. c. 2.

^r l. iv. c. 9—13. ^s Thdr. l. i. c.

25.

^t Soz. l. ii. c. 15.

^u Καί

διαβὰς πρὸς σαβαρὴν τὸν τοῦ βασιλεὺς ἐπιστάτην, ὡς φίλον εἶπε τῷ καίσαρι ἑμῶν, καὶ τὰ πρὸς πρᾶγμα τὰ τε

καὶ αὐτοῖς. Soz. l. ii. c. 9. in. Vid. &

Asseman. ubi supra. p. 183. a.

^x Καὶ αὐτὸς δ' ἑαυτὸς τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀναβί-

μασι προσέχειν ἤρην. De V. C. l. i. c. 30.

^y See p. 170.

^z De V. C. l. iii.

c. 1. p. 483. A.

4. Constantine having enlarged the city of Byzantium, and consecrated it in the year 330, by the name of Constantinople, wrote a letter to our bishop of Cæsarea, to send him fifty copies of the sacred scriptures for the use of the churches there. The letter probably was written about the year 332, and is to this purpose.

'The city that bears our name, through the goodness of providence increaseth daily, and there will be occasion for erecting in it many churches. Wherefore we hope, you will approve of our design, and take care to procure fifty copies of the divine scriptures, which you know to be necessary in churches, of fine parchment, legible, and easily portable, that they may be the fitter for use, transcribed by such as are most skilful in the art of fair-writing. Directions are given to the receiver-general of the province to furnish you with all things needful. By virtue of this letter you may demand the use of two public carriages, for the more commodious and speedy conveyance of the fairly written books to us. And if you send them by a deacon of your church, he will be made sensible of our bounty. Which orders,' as Eusebius adds, 'were immediately obeyed by us. And we sent him ternions and quaternions magnificently adorned, as appears by the emperor's answer, contained in a letter sent to us upon another occasion.'

Valesius in his notes upon this place says, that books written on parchments were generally bound up in ternions and quaternions. The former consisted of three, the latter of four sheets. So that a ternion had twelve, a quaternion sixteen pages. And upon the last page of these several divisions was written its number, 1, 2, 3, and the rest.

It is commonly supposed, that hereby is to be understood so many copies of the sacred scriptures both of the Old and the New Testament. But I have sometimes suspected, that two carriages were scarce sufficient for fifty copies of the Bible, fairly written upon parchment, and handsomely done up. If that were the case, it might lead us to think, that Constantine wrote only for copies of the New Testament.

^a De V. C. l. iv. c. 36.

^b — και εκκλησιας εν αυλη καλασκευασ-
θαι και πωλιν. *ibid.*

^c — οπως αν
αποκρισιν σωματα εν διφθεραις εικαστικ-
αις εναντιωτα τε και προς την χρησην ευ-
μετακομις, υπο τεχνων καλλιγραφων, και
αριστης της τεχνης επιταμιων, γραφηναι

μελευσιν. των θειων δηλαδη γραφων, εν
μαλιστα την τ' επισκευην και την χρησην των
της εκκλησιας λογων αναστανα εναι γινωσ-
καις. *ib.* p. 544. A.

^d — εν πολυ-
τελως ησκευαστοις τευχισιν τρις και τε-
τρας διατιμωσιν ημων. *ib.* c. 37.

The tenor of Constantine's letter leads us to suppose, that these copies of scripture were not for private use, but for the use of churches; and probably for the public readings there. However, I may add, that before the end of the fourth century it seems to have been customary, in some places at least, to have a bible, or some part of the sacred scripture, lodged in some part of the church, for people to read in at their leisure.

5. Eusebius mentions it to the honour of Constantine, that he persuaded many, both men and women, to seek the true nourishment of their souls in reading the holy scriptures.

6. Theodoret says, ' that Constantine recommended to the bishops assembled in the council of Nice, to decide all things by the scriptures. It is pity, he said, that now when their enemies were subdued, they should differ and be divided among themselves; especially when they had the doctrine of the Holy Ghost in writing. For, as he added, the writings of the evangelists and apostles, and the oracles of the ancient prophets, clearly teach us how we ought to think of God.'

So Theodoret. But as this is no where distinctly related by Eusebius, perhaps it may be best not to rely entirely upon this account.

7. I add no more. This is sufficient to satisfy us of Constantine's sincere respect for the sacred scriptures. Nor can there be any question made, but he received all those books of scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, which were generally received by the Christians of his time.

* Si quem sancta tenet meditandi in lege voluntas,

Hic poterit residens sacris intendere libris.

Paulin. Nolan. ep. 12. ad Severum.

† Τις γυναῖκα καὶ μυρία πλῆθη ἀνδρῶν ἀντιπικίει, δι' ἐνθεῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων ἀντικαταλαξίσθαι τῶν τῆ σωμαίος τρέφειν; De

Laud. Constant. c. 17. p. 661. C.

Ε — καὶ τὴν παντασίαν πνευματικὴν διδασκαλίαν ἀναγραφῶν ἐκχούλας. Εὐαγγελικαὶ γὰρ, φησὶν, βιβλῶν, καὶ ἀποστολικῶν καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν προφητῶν τὰ διδασκαλικά, σαφὲς ἡμᾶς, ἃ χρὴ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ φρονεῖν ἐκπαιδεύουσι. Thdr. H. E. l. i. c. 7. p. 25. C. D.

T H E
C R E D I B I L I T Y
O F T H E
G O S P E L H I S T O R Y;
P A R T II.

[VOL. VIII. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCL.]

P R E F A C E.

SOME of my learned friends have been of opinion, that I need not to carry on this work below Eusebius of Caesarea: and indeed I think, that the period ending with him, contains what is sufficient to make good the great design of the work, and answer the title of it, *The Credibility of the Gospel History*. But as my design leads me to shew, in the fullest manner, the genuineness and authority of the books of the New Testament, the original records of that history, and not a few material things relating to them may be collected out of later writers, I have thought it best to proceed. And I suppose, that the chapters following that of Eusebius, in this very volume, may justify my intention. But, as I hinted in the advertisement prefixed to the fifth volume, I may now contract. I shall not think myself obliged to take notice of all succeeding authors: I shall omit very many, especially after the end of the fourth century. And with regard to those whom I produce, I shall do little more than take their testimony to the scriptures, and some select passages: and I shall write their history, for the most part, no farther than may be requisite to settle their time, and distinguish their genuine writings from others, if any have been falsely ascribed to them.

C H A P. LXXI.

T H E C O U N C I L O F N I C E.

I. *The occasion of the Council.* II. *Convened by Constantine.* III. *The number of the bishops present.* IV. *Were chiefly of the Eastern part of the Roman Empire.* V. *Who presided in the Council, and the place of meeting.* VI. *Its time and duration.* VII. *Whether the Bible was placed before them?* VIII. *The points debated by them, with their Creed, Epistle, and Canons.* IX. *All the bishops signed the Creed, except a very few.* X. *The sentence passed upon Arius.* XI. *The judgments of ancients and moderns upon this Council.* XII. *The determination of the Council concerning Meletius.* XIII. *Concerning the time of keeping Easter, with remarks.* XIV. *Concerning the Arian controversy, with remarks.*

I. WHEN Constantine became master of the East in 323, or 324, after the final defeat of Licinius, a warm controversy was on foot in Egypt, and the neighbouring countries, which gave the emperor a great deal of uneasiness. In order to put (A) an end to it, and to restore peace to the churches, he sent, as Eusebius says, a bishop of great note, (Hosius bishop of Cor-

(A) They who are desirous to inform themselves farther about the council of Nice, may consult Tho. Ittigi Hist. Conc. Nic. Tillemont Mem. Ec. T. vi. Page crit. in Baron. Ann. 325. 327. 340. & Basnage Ann. &c. &c. ^a De V. C. l. ii, c. 61, &c.

duba,

duba, as Socrates^b informs us,) with a letter addressed to the bishop Alexander, and the presbyter Arius, the two principal contending parties. But notwithstanding the arguments and intreaties of the emperor's letter, and the utmost endeavours of the good man who carried it, the contention, as^c Eusebius assures us, grew still warmer, and spread wider: or, as Socrates says, neither^d Alexander nor Arius were softened thereby, and among the people disturbances increased.

II. Whereupon some time in the year 324, Constantine sent letters into the several provinces of the empire, inviting the bishops to come and assemble themselves at Nice in Bithynia: at the same time giving orders also for furnishing them with beasts, or carriages, and for bearing the expences of their journey. And according to what Eusebius writes, 'there came^e thither^f bishops from Syria, Cilicia, Phœnicia, Arabia, Palestine, Egypt, Thebais, Libya, Mesopotamia. There was^g also at the synod a bishop from Persia. Nor were there wanting some from Scythia. And the most eminent of their bishops came also from Pontus, Galatia, Pamphylia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Phrygia. Likewise from Thrace, Macedonia, Achaia, Epirus. From Spain a bishop of great note. The bishop of Rome did not come, because of his great age: but there were presbyters deputed by him.' Their names, in^h Sozomen, are Vito and Vincentius.

III. The bishops who met in this council, as Eusebius says, wereⁱ more than 250, beside presbyters, and deacons, acolythists, and others, whose number could not be easily counted. Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, as cited by^j Theodoret, says, there were about 270 bishops. Athanasius reckons the numbers differently. In one place he says, they were^k 318, in another^l about 300, in other places^m 300. Sozomen computes the number atⁿ about 320. Socrates, transcribing the passage of Eusebius before referred to, puts down^o above 300. And afterwards he says they were^p 318. Constantine, in his letter to the people of Alexandria, as exhibited by Socrates, speaks of the synod's consisting of^q more than 300. Afterwards^r of 300. Theodoret, who cites the passage of Eustathius above referred to, does himself count^s them 318. This is the num-

^b Socr. l. i. c. 7. in.

^c Ib. c. 73.

Monach. c. 66. p. 383. D.

ⁱ Οἱ τῶν

^d Οὐτε γὰρ ἀλεξάνδρος, οὐτε ἀρείος ὑπὸ τῶν γραφείων μαλασσέσθῃ. Socr. ib. c. 8. in.

^e De V. C. l. iii. c. 6, 7, 8.

Conf. Socr. l. i. c. 8. Sozom. l. i. c. 16.

^f L. i. c. 17.

^g De V. C. l. iii.

^h L. i. c. 17.

ⁱ L. i. c. 8. in.

^j Ad

Afr. Episc. c. 2. p. 892. A.

^k Τρια-

κοσιοὶ πλῆθον ἢ ἑκατὶς. Hist. Arian. ad

^l n. 23. p. 143. D.

^m n. 23. p. 143. D. Τῶν τριακοσίων τῶν

ⁿ ψηφόν. Ib. n. 25. p. 144. F. Vid. & de

^o Synodis, num. 43. p. 757. = Soz. l. i.

^p c. 17. p. 430. B. = Socr. l. i. c. 8.

^q p. 19. D. = Ib. p. 23. A.

^r Socr. l. i. c. 9. p. 30. D. = Ib.

^s p. 31. A. = L. i. c. 7. p. 24. B.

ber

ber which has been generally followed. And divers ancient writers have observed a mystery in it, that the synod should consist exactly of the same number of men, with which Abraham^{*} overcame his enemies. Epiphanius says, the number was 318, as appeared from the subscriptions then in being. And yet Eustathius, in Theodoret, does most expressly say, that he did not exactly know the number: which is somewhat strange, if there be any truth in what Epiphanius says.

The late Mr. Beausobre, who did not implicitly embrace the prevailing opinions of the times in which he lived, and allowed himself to consider impartially what he met with in antiquity, has some thoughts upon this point, which may be placed here. 'Eusebius', who made a great figure in the council of Nice, makes it not to consist of more than two hundred and fifty bishops. Eustathius of Antioch, who complimented Constantine in an oration, counts them about two hundred and seventy . . . Athanasius, who in two places says, they were three hundred more or less, and elsewhere three hundred, in his letter to the African bishops says at length, they were three hundred and eighteen. I suspect, or rather I make no doubt, but this last place has been altered. It is not likely that Athanasius, who several times expresseth himself loosely, should in one place be so precise.' So that acute author. He afterwards observes several other alterations of numbers in ancient authors, concerning this very matter; and then concludes: 'If the fact were capable of proof, I could venture to be positive, that the number of bishops present in the council of Nice was not fixed at three hundred and eighteen, till after the mystery of it had been found out.'

IV. I hope I may be excused for not giving a particular account of the names and characters of the bishops, known to have been present at the council: whether Homousians, or favourers of Arius. For this I would refer to the ancient ecclesiastical historians and their commentators. I would nevertheless observe, that the council consisted chiefly of bishops from the several parts of the East. It does not appear that there were many out of Europe: or that there were any from Africa, exclusive of Egypt and parts adjacent, except Cæcilian bishop of Carthage.

^{*} Vid. Hilar. de Synod. n. 86. & 118. Ambr. de Fid. n. 5. & passim. Liber. ap. Socr. l. iv. c. 12. p. 223. A. B. * Gen. xiv. 14. — αν και τα ονοματα εις εις διερο σωζειται τριακοσιν δικά και οκτω επεκατα. H. 69. n. 11. ^u Το γαρ

σαφες δια τον της πολυαιδριας οχλον ουχ οιοις τε ειμαι γραφειν. Ap. Thdr. l. i. c. 8. in. ^w Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 529. ^x lb. p. 531. ^y Vid. Socr. l. i. c. 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15. Soz. l. i. c. 10, 11. Thrd. l. i. c. 11.

V. I forbear to enquire who presided in the council; whether the legates of the bishop of Rome, or Eustathius of Antioch, or some other: and who² complimented the emperor in a short oration upon his coming into the assembly; whether Eustathius before named, or Eusebius of Cæsarea: as also, where the council was held; whether in a church, or in the emperor's palace. They who have a curiosity to be satisfied upon those heads, may consult the authors referred to in a note at the beginning of this chapter.

VI. The council was assembled at Nice in Bithynia in the year of Christ 325. How long it sat is not absolutely certain. Some have made it last two or three years; but learned moderns generally contract it within a small space. Basnage thinks it³ did not continue longer than six weeks, beginning the 19th of June, and ending the 25th of July. But for the most part learned men are of opinion, that it sat somewhat above two months, beginning the 19th of June, and rising the 25th of August. So⁴ Cave, and⁵ others, following⁶ Pagi; with whom Beveridge⁷ likewise agrees.

VII. Some have supposed, that⁸ the Bible, or the New Testament at least, was placed upon a table in the midst of the council, to intimate what was the rule by which they ought to decide. James Basnage in his History of the Church expressly says⁹ so: which I wonder he should do, without referring to some authority. The passage of Theodoret, alleged by me¹⁰ elsewhere, is no direct or full proof. The gospels were so placed in the council of Chalcedon; which may have been the case likewise in this council; but I do not know of any clear evidence of it.

VIII. The three points debated and determined there, as appears from all the ecclesiastical historians, and from the synodical epistle of the council itself, were the Arian controversy

² Vid. Euseb. de V. C. l. iii. c. 11. & Thdr. l. i. c. 7. Soz. l. i. c. 19.

³ Nos sesqui fere mensis spatio circumscriptum esse putamus . . . cum a Junii xix. quo synodus incepit, ad usque Julii xxv. spatii satis foret absolvendis negotiis omnibus, quorum patres una convenerant. Basn. An. 325. n. 13.

⁴ Et ita quidem post menses duos, & sex dies, die nempe Augusti xxv. celeberrimæ huic synodo finis imponitur. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 352.

⁵ Vit. Ittig. Hist. Conc. Nic. n. 10.

⁶ Vid. A. 325. n. 6, 7.

⁷ Bever. Annot. in Can. Conc. Nic. p. 42. f.

⁸ Did not Constantine the emperor,

at the opening of the first general council, lay the bible before them, as the only rule, according to which they were to proceed, and this with the approbation of all those holy fathers that were assembled in that council? Tillotson's Sermon. viii. Vol. 2. p. 64. folio.

⁹ Enfin la décision . . . étoit claire, & conforme à l'Evangile, qu'on avoit placé au milieu du Concile, afin d'être la regale de la foi. Hist. de l'Eglise, T. i. p. 494. n. 2.

¹⁰ See p. 186. i — *ἐποκειμένη ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τῇ ἀσπίδι καὶ ἀρχαῖς ἐκκλησίαις.* Labb. Conc. T. 4. p. 93. C.

before mentioned, the time of keeping Easter, and the affair of Meletius in Egypt.

There is nothing remaining of this council, but ^k the creed, the ^l synodical epistle, and ^m twenty canons: in (B) which last there is no catalogue of the books of scripture. But if the story of Paphnutius, related by ⁿ Socrates, and ^o Sozomen, be true, it may be thence argued, that this council received the epistle to the Hebrews.

IX. All the bishops present at the council did at last sign the creed, except Secundus bishop of Ptolemais, and Theonas of Marmarica, both in Egypt. Sozomen's account is, 'that' ^p 'at length they all in general decreed, that the Son was consubstantial to the Father. It was said, that there were seventeen who at the first favoured the doctrines of Arius: but at length most of these came over to the common opinion.' Socrates seems to say, that ^q 'there were five who stood out to the last, and would not receive the consubstantial doctrine: namely, the two Egyptian bishops above named, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, and Maris of Chalcedon. But the truth is, that though these three last hesitated for a time, all subscribed in the end, except Secundus and Theonas. So Philostorgius says ^r expressly; and to the like purpose ^s Theodoret: and it is manifest from the words of the council itself, in ^t their synodical epistle, to be quoted presently.

X. The synod excommunicated Arius, and those who agreed with him, and forbade his going to Alexandria, as ^u Sozomen writes. He adds, 'The ^v emperor banished Arius, and also published an edict, that Arius and his followers should be esteemed impious: that wherever any of his writings were found, they should be burned; and that if after this any were detected concealing his books, they should be liable to death.' Socrates speaking of the same edict says, one part of it was, that ^w 'Arius and his followers should be called Porphyrians, as having deserved the same brand of infamy, that had been affixed on Porphyry for writing against the Christian religion.

^k Vid. Socrat. l. i. c. 8. p. 22, & 25.

^l Ap. Socr. l. i. c. 9. Thdrt. l. i. c. 9.

^m Thdrt. l. i. c. 8. f. Soz. l. i. c. 23.

in. Epiph. H. 69. n. 11. p. 735. A.

(B) That it made no catalogue of sacred books, see Du Pin. Diff. Prelim. Sect. v. p. 12. Tillem. Concil. de Nicée, art. xvi. fin. Bafnage Hist. de l'Eglise, l. viii. c. 8. n. 1.

ⁿ Socr. l. i. c. 11.

^o Soz. l. i. c. 23.

^p — συνέγραψαν

αλληλοις πασις οι ιερεις και ομολογουν

ινας τω πατρι τον υιον εψηφισατο. κ. λ.

Soz. l. i. c. 20. in.

p. 23. A. B.

8, 9.

8, 9.

^r Ap. Socrat. l. i. c. 9.

^s Soz. l. i.

32. A. B.

32. A. B.

^t Vid. Philost. l. i. n.

^u Theod. l. i. c. 8. fin.

^v Ap. Socrat. l. i. c. 9.

^w Soz. l. i.

c. 21. p. 435. C. D. & 436. A. B.

^x Socr. l. i. c. 9. p.

This whole sentence therefore all the adherents of Arius were involved in, equally with himself, except what relates to his writings. And every part of this sentence, I think, had been decreed before the council broke up, and is included in these modest, or artful expressions of the synodical epistle. 'And' the things that have been decreed concerning him either you have already heard, or will hear; that we may not seem to insult a man, who has received the just reward of his iniquity. And ² so far has his impiety prevailed, as to draw into the like perdition Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais. For the same sentence has been passed upon them and him.'

XI. This council has received great commendations from many, both ancients and moderns. Athanasius, agreeably to the sense of many others in his own time, says, that one council was sufficient without any other. These Epiphanius ^b reckoned to be the two great benefits, which the church received from divine providence by means of Constantine: that by calling the council of Nice, he procured a determination of faith against Arians, and a certain rule for keeping Easter.

By moderns this ^c is said to be not only the first œcumenical council, but also the most celebrated council, since the time of the apostles. It is ^d the most famous, and the most venerable of all councils: than ^e which the church has nothing more illustrious.

It has also been censured by some of former, as well as later ages. Sabinus, bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, one of those Arians, which were called Macedonians, who wrote a history of councils, and is often cited by Socrates, called ^f the bishops of the council of Nice weak and illiterate men. Among moderns some have not scrupled to say, that in this, as well as in most other councils, party, passion and intrigue, bore a great sway. I put down ^g at large in the margin one censure of this kind.

^y Ap. Socr. ib. p. 28. A. B.

^z Τούτων δι' ισχυρὴν αὐτῆς ἡσέχεια, ... των γὰρ αὐτῶν κακοὶ τὸν χηρῶν. Ap. Socr. p. 28. B. ^a Τὴν ἡ χρεὶα τῶν συνόδων, ἀρκῆς τῆς ἐν νικαίᾳ γενομένης πρὸς τὴν ἀρεσκίαν καὶ τὰς ἀλλὰς αἰρέσεις; de Synod. n. 6. p. 720. A. ... Ἀλλὰ μόνον κρατεῖτο ἐν ὑμῖν ἡ ἐν νικαίᾳ παρὰ πάντων ὁμολογηθεῖσα πίστις. ... Αὕτη γὰρ ἡ ἐν νικαίᾳ σύνοδος ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ λαοφιλίᾳ κατὰ πάσης αἰρέσεως ἐστίν. Ad African. n. 10. & 11. p. 899. D.

^b H. 70. n. ix.

p. 821. B. C.

^c Oecumenicarum prima, omnium post apostolicas celebratissima synodus. Beverig. Annot. p. 42.

^d Basnag. Hist. de l'Eglise, liv. x. ch. 2. n. ii.

^e — hunc Nicænum patrum confellum, quo nihil deinde unquam illustrius habuit ecclesia. Balduin. De Leg. Const. M. l. i. p. 55.

^f Τὴν μὲν ἐν νικαίᾳ, ὡς ἀφελὴς καὶ ἰδιώτης διακρινόμενος. Socr. l. i. c. 8. p. 22. A.

^g Quod ἴδω-
τας, καὶ μὴ ἔχειν γνώσιν, τὰς ἐκείναις συνόδων
τας φησιν. c. 9. p. 31. D.

XII. Let us in the next place observe the several points brought before this council.

One was the Meletian controversy, or schism. Of which I intend not to give any farther account than was done ^h formerly. I only add, it seems to me, that there could be no occasion to call a general council for the sake of it. It might have been determined by the Egyptian bishops, and their neighbours.

XIII. Another point brought before them, and one ⁱ occasion of their meeting, was the disagreement of the churches in several parts of the world about the time of keeping Easter: which the council now determined should be observed by all on the Sunday, which followed immediately after the 14th of the moon, that happened next after the vernal equinox: which (equinox) happened that year on the 21st day of March.

Upon this we may make several remarks.

1. There was no great harm in appointing Easter to be kept by Christians in general at one and the same time, provided this rule was not too rigorously enforced. But generally, when once determinations are made concerning the most indifferent matters by a respected authority, the consequence is, that in a short time they are imposed with great rigour and severity. Proofs of it in this very case may be seen in ^k Bingham.

2. There was no necessity of a determination for fixing the time of keeping Easter. Christians might have been every where left at liberty to take the time they liked best, or not to keep it at all. For, as Socrates says, it ^l was not the design of

ad cetera post [apostolicum] consecuta
symbola, quæ in conciliis œcumenicis, ut
vocantur, cusa fuerunt, ea, quia recentiora
sunt, cum his comparari non merentur.
Et, si quod res est dicendum est, ea ab epis-
copis inter se magna cum æmulatione jur-
gambus & contententibus, ex fervore, si
non furore, partiumque studio infano ac
male feriato, præcipitata potius videri de-
bent, quam a compositis animis profecta.
Vide P. Martyrem in Comm. in 1 lib. Reg.
cap. xii. Unde & eadem veluti poma Eri-
dos fuerunt in Ecclesia, & non litium tan-
tum, & rixarum, sed tristissimarum divisi-
onum, seditionum, factionum & persecu-
tionum seminaria fuerunt. Exinde quis
sine lachrymis legere potest, quot contem-
ptiones inter Orientales & Occidentales ec-
clesias, post conditum symbolum Nicænum
de voce *quædam* vigerint. . . Videatur
Sozom. l. ii. cap. 8. Socr. l. ii. cap. 37.
Theodet. l. ii. c. 18, 19, 21. Episc. Inst.
Theol. l. iv. c. 34. p. 340. ^h See
Vol. iii. p. 337-360. ⁱ Vid. Euseb.

V. C. l. iii. cap. v.

^k Having spoken
of this controversy, as it had been managed
in the time of Pope Vigor, he adds: 'But
' when the great council of Nice had once
' undertaken to determine this matter, such
' a deference was thought proper to be
' paid to her decree, . . . that from this
' time, the opposers of the decree are com-
' monly censured either as heretics or schis-
' matics. The Audians railed at the coun-
' cil of Nice for introducing a new cus-
' tom . . . and made a separation in the
' church . . . upon which Constantine
' banished Audius their leader into Scythia.
' . . . And for this reason the imperial laws
' were often very severe upon the Quarto-
' decimans. Theodosius the great, in one
' of his laws, ranks them with the Mani-
' chees, forbidding their conventicles, con-
' fiscating their goods, rendering them in-
' testate, and liable also to capital punish-
' ment.' Bingham's Antiq. B. xx. Ch. v.
vol. x. p. 102, 103. ^l Σκοπος μὲν ἦν
ἡσυχία τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ περὶ τῆς ἑσπέρης ἐκκλησίας

the apostles to deliver laws about festivals, but to teach men virtue and piety. And some learned and acute men of late times have been of opinion, that^m so trifling a thing did not deserve all the pains that was taken about it: and that the ancients were more solicitous to procure an agreement than they should have been.

3. Notwithstanding all the care taken to bring men to uniformity in this practice, it was not obtained. Even they who were willing to keep Easter according to the order of the council, differed in their computations. Bingham says, it sometimes happened, thatⁿ the churches of one country still kept it a week, or a month, sooner than others: of which he gives several instances.

4. Once more, the council's determination concerning this point has not been approved by all moderns, any more than by all of that time. I place some proofs of this at the bottom of the^o page.

XIV. But the principal determination of the council of Nice relates to the Arian controversy.

1. And the first remark to be made here is, that^p their decisions had not the intended effect; peace and unity were not thereby restored to the churches. Of this we have full assurance from the two ecclesiastical historians, Socrates and Sozomen. The first of which writes to this purpose: 'Eusebius'

ἵνα γὰρ νομοθεσίῃ, ἀλλὰ βίον ὀρθόν καὶ τὴν θεοσεβείαν ἐιστηνέσθαι. Socr. l. v. c. 22. p. 283. D.

^m De die Paschæ quaestio res levior videri poterat. . . Superstitio-
rior fortassis fuit posteritas in hoc genere,
quam opus erat. Atque ut eam puniret
Deus, passus est, sensim vitata anni men-
sumque supputandorum vera ratione, &
æquinoctiorum diligenti consideratione ne-
glecta, eo rem recidere, ut integro prope
mense imprudentes plerumque dissideamus
ab eo, quem Niceni Patres præfixerant, die
Paschæ. Balduin. de Leg. Const. M. l. i.
p. 62, 63.

ⁿ Bing. Antiq. B. xx.
Ch. v. Vol. 9. p. 107. &c. Conf. Ittig.
Hist. Conc. Nic. p. 60, 61, 104.

^o Rectius facturos fuisse Theologos Ni-
cænos, si Pascha, æque ac Christi festum
natale, jussissent eo die celebrari, quo re-
surrexisset credimus Christum, in quemcun-
que diem hebdomadis hoc festum incideret,
censet Lutherus noster in libro de Conciliis
in T. vii. Witteb. Germ. f. 478. Nunc
tamen morem tot seculis usitatum migran-
dum esse, negat. Recte etiam summus ille
mathematicus, Jo. Bernullius, in suo ad

fenatum Basileensem responso, de die, quo
celebrandum Pascha, censet, negligi de-
buisse tam canones Nicænos, quam ope-
rosam supputationem astronomicam pleni-
lunii Paschalis. Eiusdem hæc sunt: Me-
lius fuisset, si Protestantes non essent se-
cuti statuta Concilii Nicæni, sed quendam
solis, diem in Principium veris inciden-
tem: e. g. primum post æquinoctium ver-
num, determinassent, ac decrevisset, ut eo
die annuatim festum Paschatidis celebraretur.
Hac methodo omnes lites tolli possent,
quæ superfluis subtilitatibus ortum suum
debent. Heumann. Diff. de Vero Paschate.
p. 13. not. m.

^p . . . quo Ariano-
rum contentio damnata est, eusumque symbo-
lum, quo filius Dei *genitus*, non *factus* Patri-
que *consubstantialis*, affirmabatur. Verum,
neque hac definitione, neque illorum ex-
iliis, qui subscribere renuerunt, finis malo
allatus est. Quippe Ariani, tum ultimis
Constantini annis, tum in primis sub Con-
stantio, Ariano ipso, vires resumserunt, nec
uno in Concilio prævaluerunt. Turret.
Compend. H. E. p. 33, 34. ^q Socr.
l. i. c. 23. p. 58. A. B. C. D.

' Pamphilus

Pamphilus says, that ' soon after the synod, the Egyptians
 quarrelled among themselves; though he does not say why.
 —But as we have perceived by several letters, which the
 bishops wrote to one another after the council, the word con-
 substantial was disagreeable to some. And whilst they in-
 dulged too curious inquiries about that expression, they
 raised an intestine war among themselves, which may be said
 to have been not unlike fighting in the dark: for neither
 side seemed to know, why they reproached each other. But
 they who disliked the word consubstantial, supposed that they
 who approved of it, intended to advance the sentiment of
 Sabellius, or Montanus: and therefore charged them with
 blasphemy, as ' denying the existence of the Son of God.
 On the other hand, they who were for maintaining the term
 consubstantial, supposing their adversaries to introduce po-
 lytheism, charged them with a design to revive heathenism.
 Eustathius bishop of Antioch reproached Eusebius with cor-
 rupting the Nicene faith. Eusebius answers, that he does
 not at all depart from that faith, and accuseth Eustathius
 with introducing Sabellianism. By this means they were in-
 duced to write against one another, as enemies. And though
 both sides maintained, that ' the Son of God was a distinct
 person, and had a proper existence, and owned one God in
 three persons, they made a shift, one knows not well how,
 to differ with each other; nor could they live in peace and
 quietness.' And to the like purpose " Sozomen.

The history of the church in the fourth century, fully justi-
 fies the observations of those writers. In short, notwithstand-
 ing the professions made by many, of a high veneration for
 councils, men do not value them any farther, than they coun-
 tenance their own particular opinions; and if they are under
 no restraints of external force, they contradict their decisions
 without scruple.

2. No man, or number of men, separate, or united in
 council, since the times of Christ and his apostles, have any
 right to decide in matters of faith. It is inconsistent with the
 respect due to Jesus Christ, to attempt it: unless they can
 shew themselves to be inspired, and work miracles, to manifest
 evidently a divine commission. And if any such case as that
 should happen (which is very unlikely), I think that what

' Vid. de Vit. Constantin. l. iii. c. 23.

' ως αιρεσις την υπαρξιν του Υιου του Θεου. ib. C.

' Αμφότεροι τε λεγούσι

υπογράφειν τε και ευπαρχουσα του Υιου ει-

ναι του Θεου, ενα τε Θεον εν τρισιν υπογραστ-

σιν ειναι ομολογούσας. κ. λ. p. 58. D.

" L. ii. c. 18. p. 468. C. D.

even such persons should propose, must be tried and examined by the doctrine of the gospel, delivered in the New Testament. This is agreeable to many things said by our Lord, particularly Matt. xxiii. 9, 10. *And call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your master, even Christ.* Compare 1 Cor. iii. 11—23.

3. The introducing force and authority in matters of a speculative nature, is subversive of true religion and virtue. For what avail human decisions, when they are not satisfying? If you can bring reason or scripture for any doctrine, men will assent: but ^w to say, that the bishops of such a council have so declared and determined, is not convincing: therefore it ought not to be expected, that men should confess and act, as if they were convinced. If you make use of any methods, beside those of rational arguments, to induce men to profess and act as you desire, you do what lies in your power to make them lie and prevaricate. So did this council of Nice.

It has been sometimes said, that they shew their moderation in their manner of speaking, concerning the sentence passed upon Arius. But I own, I can discern no such thing. There may be art and dissimulation, but there is no real moderation, or sincere kindness in what they write. Whatever the sentence was, they approved of it: if it had not been agreeable to their mind, Constantine would not have banished Arius, or his adherents. Moreover, before the meeting of this council, Alexander and his synod had excommunicated Arius, and banished him from the city of Alexandria.

Thus this council of Nice introduced authority and force in the church, and the affairs of religion. Or, if authority had been introduced before, they now openly countenanced it, and gave it a farther sanction.

This way of acting, may be supposed to have been the chief cause of the ruin of the Christian interest in the east. This and the like determinations of speculative doctrines, and the violent methods, by which they were enforced, may be reckoned to have paved the way for Mahometanism, more than any thing else. By these means ignorance, and hypocrisy, and tedious rituals, came to take place of honesty, true

^w Conciliis non majorem, quam Aristoteli, tribuit auctoritatem Danhauserus in *Hodosophia*, p. 129. Utrisque enim ideam habendam, quod, quæ statuerunt,

recte statuerunt, & vel Scripturæ sacræ vel rationi convenienter. Heumann. *Diss. de vero Pæsch.* p. 13. not. m.

piety, and undissembled, spiritual, and reasonable worship and devotion.

In about three hundred years after the ascension of Jesus, without the aids of secular power, or church authority, the Christian religion spread over a large part of Asia, Europe, and Africa: and at the accession of Constantine, and convening the council of Nice, it was almost every where, throughout those countries, in a flourishing condition. In the space of another three hundred years, or a little more, the beauty of the Christian religion was greatly corrupted in a large part of that extent, its glory defaced, and its light almost extinguished. What can this be so much owing to, as to the determinations and transactions of the council of Nice, and the measures then set on foot, and followed in succeeding times?

These impositions poison the waters of the sanctuary at the very fountain. They require the ministers of Christ, the officers of his church, to subscribe certain articles upon pain of heavy forfeitures: and a subscription to these articles, whether believed or not, gives a right to preferment. If any subscribe what they are not satisfied about, and so enter into the service of the church (which is very likely to happen), they gain and hold their offices by the tenure of hypocrisy. How can religion flourish in this way? Will the persons who have so subscribed, (without conviction, or against it), be sincere and upright ever afterwards? will they, upon all other occasions, speak the truth without fear or favour, who have once solemnly and deliberately prevaricated? and can others intirely confide in them? or can they heartily reverence them, as upright and disinterested men?

The temptation upon some occasions must be exceeding strong, and many specious things may be offered, to put a fair colour upon unrighteousness. Even an appearance of religion may concur with secular interest, to impose upon the mind, and lead to what is not to be justified. Has a person at great expence of study and labour qualified himself for the service of the church, with a sincere view of usefulness in an important station? how grievous must it be, to be after all disappointed and excluded! If any obstacles lie in the way, there is great danger of compliance, not quite consistent with duty and conscience, provided those bars cannot be removed.

The temptation may be still stronger to some, who are already settled in agreeable stations. How trying is this case! This was the case of Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea; he was in a station of great honour and usefulness, beloved by his people,

and they by him : moreover, he might imagine, and reasonably, that his usefulness as an author, depended much upon his continuance in that station. Without the advantages which he there enjoyed, he could not carry on his various designs for composing useful books, which he hoped might be of extensive service to the Christian religion, in that and future times. Was not this a temptation to sign what he did not approve of ?

I beg leave, however, to add here, that I would be cautious of condemning particular persons, whose circumstances I am not exactly acquainted with. Nor do I absolutely condemn Eusebius : the reason is, that he was present at the drawing up of the Nicene Creed, and declared in what sense he understood the word consubstantial. This is an advantage which may not be allowed to all : when they have not a liberty to explain themselves, it will cause a diversity of case.

Tillemont has these words : ‘ It * was then, fear of banishment, and of the shame of having so illustrious an assembly the witness of their ignominy, that induced the Arians to make haste to renounce the doctrines that had been condemned, to anathematize them, and subscribe the consubstantial faith, after all the other bishops ; being led by Eusebius of Nicomedia, to confess with the mouth the faith of the church, without having it in the heart, as the event shewed.’

How can any man speak in this manner ! how can any man triumph in the falls of his fellow-creatures, who has any respect for the Lord Jesus, any love of truth and sincerity, any tenderness of conscience, any sense of equity and goodness ! Those Arians confessed with the mouth, and signed with the hand, what they did not believe. For that they are to be blamed. But how came they to do so ? It was owing to a fear of ignominy and banishment. But why were they put in fear ? Why was a law made to banish such as did not believe the consubstantial doctrine ? They offended, who signed ; it is allowed : and are they innocent, who laid before them a temptation to sign ? Was there a necessity, that they should be required to sign, whether they believed or not ? Can you shew any ground or authority from reason, or from Jesus Christ, whereby you are allowed or enjoined to require your brethren to sign certain speculative articles, whether they believe them or not ? Nay, is not this quite contrary to the design and example of the Lord Jesus, who never proposed to men any arguments, but such as were suited to gain the judgment ? and

* Le Concile de Nicée, Art. x. near the end. Mem. Tom. vi.

who, when many forsook him, who had followed him for a time, took that opportunity, to refer it to the choice of those who still stayed with him, whether *they also would go away?*

If any pretend it to be of importance, that others should sign or profess certain doctrines, supposed by them to be true; I would answer, that sincerity is of yet greater importance. And you ought never to endeavour to secure the interest of speculative points, with the prejudice of what is of greater moment, honesty and integrity.

4. It remains, that when this council met, instead of deciding by their authority, and enforcing by worldly menaces or recompences, any speculative doctrines, they should rather have recommended forbearance and moderation to all parties.

They ought to have advised men to practise love and forbearance one to another, and should have intreated them, if there be any *bowels^{*} and mercies*, and for the love of Jesus, *to receive^{*} one another in love*, as the apostle says, *but not to doubtful disputations*: that is, to own each other for brethren, and communicate together as Christians, notwithstanding some differences of opinion. Or, if any could not persuade themselves to do this, that yet they should allow each other full liberty to profess their principles, and carry on their worship, according to their own sentiments, in their religious assemblies, in their own way. This at least they should have recommended, and with the utmost earnestness, as altogether reasonable, agreeable to the gospel, and absolutely necessary for the honour of the Christian name. And they should have humbly recommended it to the emperor, to take care accordingly, and in his great wisdom to provide, that all who acted peaceably should be protected, in the several cities where they dwelt: and that all who caused tumults and disturbances, or by any outward act infringed the liberty of their neighbours, on account of diversity of opinion, should be restrained and punished, as the nature of their offence required.

Possibly some may say, that such thoughts as these are founded upon the experience and observation of later ages; and that all this is more than could be reasonably expected of any men, however wise, at that time.

To which I answer, that it is no more than might have been expected: for it is not more than what men are taught by the common principles of equity. The gospel too, teaches and enacts moderation and forbearance, and condemns all im-

^y John vi. 67.

^{*} Philip. ii. 2.

^{*} Rom. xiv. 1.

position on the consciences of men, and all force and violence in things of religion.

Farther, what has been here suggested, is no more than what the Christians had before demanded and expected of heathens in power, as just and reasonable: they were therefore self-condemned in acting otherwise. If it was reasonable, that they should be tolerated and protected by heathen emperors; much more was it reasonable and evident, that all other sects of Christians should be tolerated and protected by that sect which happened to be the most numerous and powerful.

Finally, for the main part, this is no other than the advice sent^b by Constantine, in his letter to Alexander and Arius, which the bishops assembled in council should have stood to. Nothing could have been more for their honour, and the interest of religion, than for them to have enforced with all their credit, the sage, and pious, and moderate counsels of the emperor.

I have taken all this freedom, thus to propose these thoughts. But I do not mention them so much by way of blame and censure, as with a view of amendment; that Christians in general may at length be so wise, as to consult the true interest of their religion: and hoping, that they who are in high stations in the church, and have a powerful influence, will improve all opportunities, and use their best endeavours, that *the^c moderation of Christians may be known unto all men.*

C H A P. LXXII.

EUSEBIUS, BISHOP OF CÆSAREA.

- I. *A brief account of his life.* II. *His works.* III. *General remarks upon his works.* IV. *Whether he was an Arian?* V. *His character.* VI. *Select passages.* VII. *Four passages concerning the books of the New Testament.* VIII. *Remarks upon those passages.* IX. *Books of the New Testament received by Eusebius himself.* X. *Of the controverted and spurious writings mentioned by him.* XI. *The time of writing St. Matthew's gospel, according to Eusebius.* XII. *The language of St. Matthew's gospel, and of the epistle to the Hebrews.* XIII. *Various readings.* XIV. *Of the canon of the Old Testament, received by this writer.* XV. *General divisions of scripture.* XVI. *Respect for the scriptures.* XVII. *The sum of his testimony.*

^b Vid. Euseb. de Vit. Conſt. l. ii. c. 64. &c. & Socr. l. i. c. 7.

^c Philip. iv. 5.

I. 'EUSEBIUS bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine,' says^a Jerom, 'a man most studious in the divine scriptures, and together with the martyr Pamphilus, very diligent (A) in making a large collection of ecclesiastical writers, published innumerable volumes, some of which are these: The Evangelical Demonstration in twenty books: The Evangelical Preparation, in fifteen books: Five books of the Theophanie: Ten books of Ecclesiastical History: Chronical Canons of universal history, and an Epitome of them: and Of the Difference between the Gospels: Ten books upon Isaiah: Against Porphyry, who at the same time wrote in Sicily, thirty books as some think, though I have never met with more than twenty: Topics in one book: An Apology for Origen in six books: The Life of Pamphilus, in three books: Several small Pieces concerning the Martyrs: most learned Commentaries upon the 150 Psalms, and many other works. He flourished chiefly under the emperors Constantine and Constantius. On account of his friendship with the martyr Pamphilus he received his surname from him.'

Eusebius, as is generally thought, and with some good degree of probability, was born at Cæsarea in Palestine, about^b the year 270, or, as some^c think, sooner. We have no account of his parents, or who were his instructors in early life. Nor is there any thing certainly known of his family and relations: for Pamphilus, as is evident, was only a friend. Arius, in a letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, calls our Eusebius his^d brother. But I do not think, that the word ought to be understood literally. It is not common for two brothers

^a Eusebius Cæsareæ Palestinæ episcopus, in scripturis divinis studiosissimus, & bibliothecæ divinæ cum Pamphilo martyre diligentissimus perveſtigatoꝝ, edidit infinita volumina, de quibus hæc sunt: Ευαγγελικῆς ἀποδείξεως libri viginti: Ευαγγελικῆς πρεπαράσεως libri quindecim: Οἰοφανίας libri quinque: Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ libri decem: Chronicorum Canonum omnimoda historia, & eorum Ἐπιτομή: Et de Evangeliorum Diaphonia: In Isaiam libri decem: Et contra Porphyrium, qui eodem tempore scribebat in Sicilia, ut quidam putant, libri triginta, de quibus ad me viginti tantum pervenerunt: Τοπικῶν liber unus: Ἀπολογία: pro Origine libri sex: De Vita Pamphili libri tres: De Martyribus alia opuscula: Et in centum quinquaginta Ψαλμοι eruditissimi commentarii, & multa alia. Floruit maxime sub Constantino imperatore & Constantio. Et ob amicitiam

Pamphili martyris ab eo cognomentum sortitus est. Hieron. de V. I. c. 81.

(A) That interpretation was justified formerly. See Vol. iii. p. 335, 336. And it is the sense in which the words were always understood, till very lately. Says Valesius, speaking of Pamphilus: Qui cum literarum sacrarum singulari amore flagaret, omnesque ecclesiasticorum scriptorum libros... summo studio conquereret, celeberrimam scholam ac bibliothecam instituit Cæsareæ. De Vit. & Scriptis Euseb. Cæs. sub init.

^b Natus... circa annum, si divinare liceat, 270. Cav. H. L. in Euseb. Cæs.

^c Tillemont argues, that he was born about the year 264. Euseb. Art. i. Vid. & Vales. de Vit. & Script. Euseb. Cæs. sub init.

^d Εὐσεβίου ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἢ Καίσαρος. Ap. Thdr. l. i. c. 5. p. 21. A.

to have one and the same name. Eusebius of Nicomedia, speaking of him of Cæsarea, calls him * his lord. And the bishop of Cæsarea calls him of Nicomedia the great † Eusebius: but neither says he was related to the other. Arius therefore, it is likely, gives our Eusebius the title of brother of the other Eusebius, as he also was bishop, and they were good friends, and to intimate, that they were both of the same opinion upon the doctrine controverted at that time.

It is somewhat probable, though not certain, that our Eusebius was ordained presbyter by Agapius, bishop of Cæsarea, of whom he has made a very honourable † mention. He had a long and happy intimacy with Pamphilus, presbyter in that church, who was imprisoned in the year 307, and obtained the crown of martyrdom in 309. During the time of that imprisonment Eusebius was much with his friend. After the martyrdom of Pamphilus he went to Tyre, where he saw † many finish their testimony to Jesus in a glorious manner. From thence, as it seems, he † went into Egypt: where too he was a spectator of the sufferings and patience of many of his fellow-christians: where likewise he seems to have been imprisoned. And because he did not suffer, as some others did, it has been insinuated, that * he procured his liberty by sacrificing, or some other mean compliance, unbecoming a Christian. But that is a general accusation without ground. No one was ever able to specify any mean act of compliance in particular, as appears from Potamon's charge in Epiphanius. If † Eusebius had sacrificed, or done any thing like it, he would not have been made bishop of Cæsarea, nor invited to the see of Antioch. Eusebius either made Pamphilus many visits, or was shut up with him in prison: and yet he has never been reproached, that I know of, because he did not suffer with him. In like manner he may have been for some time in prison in Egypt, and released without any thing dishonourable in the (B) affair.

^c — τῷ διωκτῇ μὲν Εὐσεβίῳ. Ap. Thdr. l. i. c. 6. in.

^f — πρὸς Εὐσεβίον τοῦ μέγαν. Cont. Marcell. l. i. p. 18. D. — ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ μέγαν Εὐσεβίου. κ. λ.

ib. p. 20. A. ^g H. E. l. vii. c. 30. p. 288. C. ^h Vid. ib. l. viii. c. 7. p. 299. A. ⁱ Ib. c. 8, 9.

^k Vid. Epiph. H. 67. n. 7. & Athan. Apol. contra Arian. p. 130. F.

^l Vid. Euseb. in Cav. H. L. Basnag. Ann. 326. n. 18. Vales. de Vit. & Script. Euseb. p. 3. m. Du Pin Eusebius de Cæ-

sarée init. Martin. Hank. de Byzant. Hist. Scriptorib. in Vit. Euseb. cap. 120.

(a) I cannot tell, whether it will not be thought too trifling to observe the conduct of the Benedictine editors of St. Athanasius upon this head. Athanasius having said in his Apology, that Eusebius of Cæsarea was accused by some confessors of having sacrificed, they put this note at the bottom of p. 130. Epiphanius ait, Eusebium C. a Polamone Aegyptio objuratum fuisse—Quæ fufius in Athanasii vita agemus. But

Agapius

Agapius succeeded Theotecnus in the see of Cæsarea. And it is the more general opinion, that ^m Eusebius succeeded Agapius in 315. But some place ⁿ Agricolaus between Agapius and him. Nevertheless that will not much ^o protract the time of our author's episcopate. This is certain, that ^p he was bishop of Cæsarea in 320 at the latest. After which we can perceive, that he was present at most of the synods held in that part of the world. He died in the year 339 or 340.

I omit many particulars, desiring to be as concise as possible. If we had Eusebius's life, written by his successor ^q Acacius, we should have the pleasure to be informed of many things which we are now ignorant of.

II. I must give some account of Eusebius's works: though, for the sake of brevity, I should have been very glad to be excused.

When an author's works are somewhat numerous, learned moderns generally speak in the first place of such as are still in being, then of those which are lost. The order of time pleaseth me best, in this instance at least. I therefore shall speak of Eusebius's writings, extant and not extant all together in the continued order of time, so far as I can attain it. And as I do not reckon myself obliged to give a particular account of all his pieces, mentioned in ancient authors; I refer to ^r several learned moderns, some of which have treated largely of them.

1. An exact edition of Origen's Hexapla. This, so far as I recollect, is very seldom ^s taken notice of by learned moderns in their accounts of Eusebius's works; but I think it should not have been omitted. It is likely, that it was one of our author's first undertakings. He had the assistance of Pamphilus in this work: which therefore we may suppose was finished

in their Vit. Ath. p. 21. having cited at length the passage of Epiphanius, they add: Non defunt tamen, qui Eusebium purgare curent a crimine vel suspicione oblatis diis sacrificiis. Verum nobis ad ulteriora properantibus hæc non licet subtilius explorare. But if Eusebius had been a favourite of theirs, I am apt to think, they would have stayed a while, to offer a word or two in defence of him. And were they not obliged by the fore-mentioned note to be a little more particular? ^m Eusebii Cæsariensis episcopi — obitus recte hoc anno a Baronio consignatur. Mortuo Agapio — cum persecutio jam sedata, & pax ecclesiae reddita esset, Eusebius communi omnium consensu in ejus locum substitutus

erat. Alii successorem Agapii ponunt. — Verum, ut observat Valesius, — Page. 340. n. 23.

ⁿ Defuncto, qui Agapio successerat, Agricola, quem vel invita Valesii chronologia retinendum esse putamus, ecclesiae Cæsariensis episcopatum iniiit anno circiter 315. Bafn. Ann. 326. n. 18.

^o See the preceding note. ^p See Tillemont in Eusebius de Cæsarea, § ii. Mem. Ecc. Tom. vii. ^q Vid. Socr.

l. ii. c. 4. ^r H. Vales. de vit. & scriptis Euseb. Cæsar. Tillem. Mem. E. T. vii. Eusebius art. v—viii. Cav. H. L. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 4. T. vi. p. 30. &c. Du Pin. Bib. des Aut. Ec.

^s It is mentioned by Du Pin, T. ii. p. 3.

about the year 306, before that excellent man and martyr came into trouble. I need say nothing of it here, having given an account of it ¹ formerly.

2. An Apology for Origen in six books: in five of which he had likewise the assistance of Pamphilus in prison. The sixth was written by Eusebius alone, after the martyrdom of Pamphilus. It was composed therefore in 308 and 309. The first book remains in a Latin translation of Rufinus: I spoke of this work ² formerly.

3. The Life of Pamphilus in three books, probably written in 309 or 310, but not extant. I have spoken sufficiently of it ³ already.

4. A book of the Martyrs of Palestine, who suffered in the persecution of Dioclesian and Maximin, written about the year 311 or 312. This has been reckoned by some a part of the eighth book of the Ecclesiastical History: but Valesius has more properly placed it by itself, after that book, as a supplement to it.

5. Among Eusebius's Works Jerom mentioned several small pieces concerning the martyrs. And, as Tillemont ⁴ observes, 'beside that just mentioned, there was another book, which Eusebius quotes' several times in his Ecclesiastical History. 'It was a collection of the Acts of the ancient martyrs, where in he had placed at length the history of the martyrs of Lyons in the time of Marcus Antoninus: Apollonius the Roman senator in the time of Commodus, with his Apology: The Acts of Pionius, martyred at Smyrna, and others.' But of this work, as ⁵ just hinted, Eusebius inserted several things, by way of extract at least, in his Ecclesiastical History. This collection may have been made in 312 or 313, or soon after.

6. One book against Hierocles, who had made a comparison of Apollonius Tyanæus with our Saviour Jesus Christ: a small piece, not mentioned by Jerom, but undoubtedly genuine, and still extant ⁶ in the original Greek. It may have been composed in 312, or 313, or sooner; for we do not know the exact time.

7. A confutation of Porphyry in thirty books. Valesius was of opinion, that this work was not composed until after the Ecclesiastical History: because in ⁷ the sixth book of that

¹ See vol. iii. p. 326, 349. ² *ibid.*
p. 336, 345, 346. ³ *ibid.* p. 338, 339.
⁴ Euseb. de Cæs. art. vii. ⁵ ———
H. E. l. 5. Proem. ——— τῇ τῶν μαρτύρων

συναγωγῇ ἀπὸς ἑαυτοῦ. *ib.* c. 4. fin.
⁶ See note γ. ⁷ Ad Calcem libr.
de Dem. Ev. p. 511—515. ⁸ H. E.
l. vi. c. 19.

work, Eusebius quotes a passage of Porphyry's third book against the Christians, without taking notice of his own answer to him. But that argument does not appear to me decisive. Eusebius had many fair occasions in several of his writings to refer to his Confutation of Porphyry, but has never done so that I remember. Nevertheless we cannot hence conclude, that it was written after all his other works, which is very improbable. Jerom supposes, that Porphyry was living at the same time in Sicily; which is an argument, that he thought this one of our author's most early performances. If it was so, that may have been one reason why it was not much esteemed, as being written before Eusebius had attained to all that maturity of knowledge and understanding, by which he was afterwards distinguished. For that reason too he might not be disposed to quote it himself. It is observable, that Apollinarius wrote against Porphyry after him: which may be reckoned an argument, that in this work Eusebius had not fully answered the expectation of the public. Nay, Philostorgius made no scruple to say, that^b in his books against Porphyry, Apollinarius greatly excelled our author. St. Jerom, as it seems, did not^c esteem this one of Eusebius's best books. I might farther add; if this voluminous confutation of Porphyry had been written after Eusebius became acquainted with Constantine, it is likely he would have dedicated it to the emperor, and we should have had it distinctly mentioned in the Life of Constantine. Le Clerc^d thought the loss of this work to be the greatest loss we have sustained, as to any writings of this author. And indeed it is very probable, that we of these times should have been pleased to see Porphyry's objections in his own words, as alleged by Eusebius. In other respects, I imagine, it would not have equalled the remaining work of the Evangelical Preparation, or the still extant books of the Demonstration. After all, I do not know the exact time when this work was published; but I am inclined to think, it must have appeared before the council of Nice.

8. Photius speaks of two books of our author, entitled^e 'A Confutation and Apology, in which he proposes several 'heathen objections, and answers them very well.' This work is not extant; nor do we know the time of writing it. It de-

^b Οἱ Φρσι, ἀπολλινάριος κατὰ πορφύριον
γράψας ἐπὶ τοῦ κρείττους τῶν ἡνωμένων
ἐπιστολῶν καὶ ἀπολ. Phil. l. viii. c. 15.

^c Fortissimos libros contra Porphyrium
scribit Apollinarius. Ecclesiasticam pulchre
Eusebius historiam texuit. Ad Pammach.

& Ocean. Ep. 44. al. 65. p. 342. supr. m.
Vide ejusdem. Præf. ad Dan.

^d Bib. Univ. T. x. p. 495.

^e Εὐ-
στράτιος ἐλεγχὸς καὶ ἀπολογία λόγος δύο. κ. λ.
Cod. 13. p. 11.

served,

served, however, to be mentioned, as one of the many writings of this bishop, in defence of the Christian religion.

9. Five books of the Theophany, or the coming of the Messiah: mentioned by Jerom; not extant, nor do we clearly know the design of it.

10. Of the difference between the Gospels: mentioned by Jerom, not extant, but undoubtedly designed to reconcile the seeming contrarieties in the accounts of the several evangelists.

11. Ten Evangelical Canons, with a letter to Carpianus, shewing what things are related by four, what by three, what by two, what by one. These canons, with the letter to Carpianus, are usually prefixed to the best editions of the New Testament, and the letter may be also seen¹ elsewhere. We do not know the exact time of this work.

12. A letter to Euphrasion, mentioned by ² Athanasius, and certainly written before the council of Nice.

13. St. Jerom says, that ³ Eusebius and others had largely explained the first epistle to the Corinthians. But whether he intends a distinct work I cannot tell. However, Tillemont's expressions are, that ⁴ he made a large Commentary upon that epistle.

14. Of the Fruitfulness of the ancients: expressly mentioned by our author in ⁵ his Evangelical Preparation, and probably referred to, and intended by him in a passage of the ⁶ Demonstration.

15. The Evangelical Preparation, in fifteen books, as mentioned by Jerom, still extant. This work, as well as the Chronicle, and the History, are with great justice highly commended by ⁷ Joseph Scaliger.

16. The Evangelical Demonstration in twenty books. Which work Eusebius promiseth at the end of the former. The last ten books are lost. And until lately the beginning of the first book, and the conclusion of the tenth, were missing: but were published by Fabricius⁸ with great applause in 1725. This work Eusebius evidently mentions at the beginning⁹ of his Ecclesiastical History, and therefore it was first written.

¹ Vid. Fab. Bib. Gr. T. vi. p. 97. &c.

² De Synodis, c. 17. p. 730. E.

³ Origines—Pierius, Eusebius Cæsariensis—latissime hanc epistolam interpretati sunt. Hieron. Ep. 31. al. 52. p. 243. f.

⁴ As before, § 10.

⁵ — in ois

επιστολῶν καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν παλαιῶν πολυπαιδίας. Præp. E. l. vii. c. 8. p. 310. f.

⁶ Dem. l. i. c. 9. p. 33. C.

⁷ Taceo auctoris multiplicem eruditionem—summam vetustatis peritiam, qui in omnibus priscorum auctorum monumentis peregrinatus illum divinum προπαρασκευῆς thesaurum collegit. Prolegom. in Chr. p. 18.

⁸ Vid. Syllab. auct. de Veritate Relig. Christian.

⁹ Vid.

17. An Epistle^p to the church at Cæsarea, concerning his subscribing the Nicene Creed.

18. An Oration in the twentieth year of Constantine's^q reign, 325, pronounced in the presence of Constantine and the fathers of the Nicene council. Not extant.

19. The Chronicle, in two books: or as Jerom said, Chronical Canons of Universal History, and their Epitome. It is likely, that by their Epitome he means the second book, which was shorter than the first, and represented in a summary way the substance of it. In another place this work is called by Jerom, 'Chronological Canons. The original is lost, except some fragments preserved in Greek authors. We have only a Latin version of Jerom, who in this, as well as other things, is both an author and interpreter. His additions relate chiefly to the affairs of the western part of the Roman empire, with which Eusebius was little acquainted. The Chronicle was published in 325, as Pagi^r says. And Jerom assures us, that^s it came down to the twentieth year of Constantine. Nevertheless Eusebius refers to it in^t his Preparation. Tillemont therefore thinks there must have been two editions. But perhaps in the Preparation he only speaks of the work, as then in hand, though not published: which may well be the case sometimes with an author who writes much. The Chronicle was a work of prodigious labour and learning.

20. The Evangelical History, in ten books, published, as it^u seems, in 326. Du Pin having shewn the importance of this work adds: 'It must be owned however, that^v Eusebius's History has not all the perfection which one could wish: that^w it is not written in an agreeable manner: that it is not exact: that the author often enlarges on things that might be lightly^x passed over, and mentions other things succinctly, which^y should have been related at large.' Tillemont says: 'Notwithstanding^z some defects, which may be observed, it will^a be always a most valuable and most important work, and most^b useful to the church. Without Eusebius we should scarce^c have had any knowledge of the history of the first ages of^d Christianity, or the authors who wrote in that time. All^e the Greek authors of the fourth century, who undertook to^f write the history of the church, have begun where Eusebius^g ended, as having nothing considerable to add to his labour.'

^p Ap. Socr. l. i. c. 8. p. 23, 24. Thdrt. Euseb. Chr. p. 4, & 181. ^u — 19
l. i. c. 12. ^q Vid. de Vit. C. l. i. in τοις ποικίλοις τῶν Χριστιανῶν κειμένοις. Pr.
Proem & Valef. Annot. ^r Post tem- E. l. x. p. 484. D. ^s Pagi Ann. 326.
porum canones. Præf. ad lib. de Loc. n. 8. ^t Bibl. T. ii. p. 5, 6.
Hebr. ^v An. 325. n. 51. ^w Vid. ^x Euseb. vi. Mem. T. vii.

21. The Topics, so called in Jerom's catalogue: consisting of two books, the second of which is still extant in Greek, somewhat altered, with Jerom's version, who says, 'that' after 'the Ecclesiastical History, and Chronological Canons, Eusebius published a Geographical Description of Judea, according to the divisions of the several tribes, with a map of Jerusalem, and the temple, and proper descriptions: and at last this small book, containing the names of the cities, mountains, and rivers of the country, according to the order of the letters of the alphabet.' It was a kind of dictionary of places mentioned in the scriptures.

22. A Treatise concerning Easter, mentioned * by Eusebius in the Life of Constantine, and by Jerom in his Catalogue, in the article ^b of Hippolytus. This work is not extant. It might be written about the year 334.

23. An ^c Oration in praise of Constantine, still extant, spoken at Constantinople in the emperor's presence, before ^d the end of the year 335. It is as much an argument for the truth of the Christian religion, as a panegyric upon the emperor. It is, in my opinion, a fine performance: and has been already commended by Du Pin ^e for its eloquence and politeness, as well as on other accounts.

24. A Description of the ^f Church of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem, and its ornaments, and the presents sent thither by the emperor: composed in 335.

25. Five books against Marcellus: or, as they are generally divided and entitled, Two books against Marcellus, and three books of Ecclesiastical Theology, written in 336: and Eusebius handles his antagonist very roughly. Marcellus, he says, teaches Sabellianism, and ^g thereby apostatizes from Christ and the grace of the gospel. Marcellus revives ^h the impious and atheistical heresy of Sabellius. His heresy exceeds ⁱ all the impious heresies that ever were, and the like.

26. The Life of Constantine, in four books, written in the latter part of the year 337, or the beginning of 338. Some few have denied this ^k to be a work of Eusebius: but certainly without all reason. It has many internal characters of genuineness; for it is entirely in Eusebius's manner, and here are

^z Hier. Pr. in libr. de situ & nominib. locor. Hebr. T. 2. p. 382, 383.

^a De V. C. l. iv. c. 34, 35.

V. l. c. 61.

^c De V. C. l. iv. c. 33, & 46.

^d Vid. Pagi Ann. 335. iii. & 336. iii.

^e Ubi sup. p. 4. a.

^f Vid. de V. C. l. iv. c. 33, & 46.

^g — της δε εν χριστω γνωσεως τι και χαριτος πολλοτριμνης. Contra Marcell. l. i. p. 5. A. ^h — ως αβρα και δυσσεβη πολυμωλια. De Ec. Th. l. i. c. 5. p. 63. C. D. ⁱ — καινοτερον η καλα πασαν αβρα αιρεσιν. l. ii. p. 33. C. ^k Vid. Pagi Ann. 340. n. 25.

letters of the emperor to the author. Not only ¹ Socrates, but ² Photius also, and other ancient writers, speak of it as his. Jerom's silence is of no importance. He owns, that Eusebius wrote many books beside those expressly mentioned by him. This work has been generally reckoned ³ rather a panegyric than ⁴ history.

27. A Commentary upon the 150 Psalms, mentioned and commended by Jerom in his Catalogue: but wanting in late ages, till Montfaucon in the year 1705 published it as far as the 119th Psalm. That learned writer says, there ⁵ is not any the least reason to doubt the genuineness of what is published by him. Eusebius has no where in his remaining works quoted this Commentary: for which reason it may be argued, that ⁶ it is one of his last works. It is probable, that it was written ⁷ some good while after the respect shewn to our Saviour's sepulchre at Jerusalem, in 326 or 327.

28. A Commentary upon the prophecies of Isaiah, mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue, and elsewhere: published likewise by Montfaucon. It seems to me, that some things, not Eusebius's, have been inserted in these Commentaries, especially in that upon Isaiah, as we now have it, taken from the Greek Chains. Beside some things inserted, probably, afterwards, there seem likewise to be observations, or interpretations, taken by the author from Origen, or other commentators, more ancient than himself.

29. Fourteen small pieces in ⁸ Latin, published by James Simond, who makes no doubt of their being genuine. Cave ⁹ was rather inclined to think, they were written by Eusebius Emisenus. Fabricius ¹⁰ dislikes that opinion, and is willing, that our Eusebius should be reckoned author of them.

1.) The first two are against Sabellius. 'These, says ¹¹ Tillemont, manifestly oppose Marcellus, and may have been ¹² written by Eusebius in the latter part of his life.' On the other hand it may be said: What occasion had our author to write any thing against Marcellus, beside the five books before mentioned? I have sometimes suspected, that Eusebius's known aversion for Sabellianism induced some transcriber of these pieces, to put his name at the head of them.

¹ Socr. l. i. c. 1. & l. v. c. 22. p. 285. Prelim. cap. 2. § i. ⁴ Ib. c. 3. § vi.
² Co. p. 127. p. 305. ³ Vid. ⁵ Ap. Bib. PP. Max. T. iv. init.
 Socr. l. i. c. 1. p. 5. A. B. & Thdr. l. i. ⁶ H. L. in Euseb. ⁷ Bib. Gr.
 c. 13. in. ⁸ Vid. ejusd. Prelim. T. vi. p. 103. ⁹ As before, § ix.
 cap. 3e § i. ii. ¹⁰ Vid. Montf.

It is generally allowed, that they are translated from the Greek. But here are abundance of studied antitheses, and some * jingles of Latin words, as if they were written in that language. The empire was become * Christian, when these pieces were written.

2.) The third piece is a homily concerning the Resurrection, by Tillemont reckoned not worthy of Eusebius. However, here ⁷ is a good argument for a future state from reason.

3.) The fourth, upon the Resurrection and Ascension, is, in the main, a fine performance. The author ² argues exceeding well for the truth of Christ's resurrection, and of the Christian religion from the former character of Christ's apostles, from the gifts of the Spirit poured down upon them, and from their conduct and success after the crucifixion of Jesus.

4.) I shall give no distinct account of the rest of these pieces. I shall, however, refer to some remarkable things in them.

5.) Here are some observations ^a upon the third chapter of Zechariah, and the beginning of the book of Job, that deserve the notice of the curious.

6.) Moses, the ^b author says, was as a lamp or candle in a house: but Christ as the sun enlightens the world.

7. Here are references to ^c the first chapter of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John. The ^d Acts of the apostles are much and often quoted. And ^e the gospels are called sacred and divine.

8.) He speaks ^f of the gospels, the Acts, and Paul's epistles, as open to be read by all who please.

9.) He expresses a great respect for the scriptures, and is for ^g having all controversies in things of religion decided by them.

* Mortuus est, ut occideret mortem. Condemnatus est, ut condemnaret corruptelam, p. 5. E. Misit filium obedientem, ut salvaret hominem inobedientem. ib. C.

^x Aderant nobiscum & reges & iudices p. 21. C. Si autem reges, exercitus & leges pro religione sunt. p. 22. C.

^y p. 10. D. E. F. ^z — Unde & majora servata sunt mirabilia post mortem, quam ea quæ ante mortem sunt facta.

— Si enim stant eorum templa, non resurrexit — p. 17. C. Putas, in quinquaginta diebus piscator rusticanus ex vico fluctavit omnem linguam? p. 21. E. Vid. & F. G. H. Cogitaverunt autem piscatores ad mundum exire. — Sine literis, ad eruditos imperiti, ignobiles ad ingenuos? p. 22. A. B. C. Præconum autem abjectio,

ignobilitas, nulla doctrina, egestas, numerus parvus. ib. D. E. ^a p. 24. E. &c.

p. 25. B. E. ^b Quid valuit lucerna Moyse? — Si autem unum populum per

signa non suavit, Jesus autem per crucem, per scandalum, & non per signa aut prodigia mundum transtulit ad Dei cultum. Moyse lucerna ne quidem uni domui sufficit: Jesus autem sol justitiæ. p. 20. D.

^c p. 44. A. B. ^d In Actibus enim scriptum est Apostolorum. p. 21. A. 22. A. & passim. ^e — a sanctis Evan-

geliis & vere divinis. p. 42. G.

^f Hi sunt gustus prædicationum Domini. Plena autem Evangelia sunt volentibus bene legere: pleni Actus Apostolorum sunt, & epistolæ Pauli. p. 23. D.

^g Unam solis scripturis contenti essemus.

III. Of all Eusebius's works the Ecclesiastical History is the most valuable: but, as it seems to me, the least accurate of all his large works, that are come down to us in any good measure entire. Some faults may be owing to haste, others to defect of critical skill, others to want of candour and impartiality. For our great author, as well as most other men, had his affections. He was favourable to some things, and persons, and prejudiced against others.

1. He was a great admirer of Origen: in which he was in the right. Nevertheless he should not have therefore omitted all notice of Methodius, because ^h he was Origen's adversary.

2. He had a great zeal for the Christian religion: and so far, undoubtedly, he was in the right. Nevertheless he should not have attempted to support it by weak and false arguments: which a good cause never needs.

3. Agbarus's letter to our Saviour, and our Saviour's letter to Agbarus, copied at length in our author's Ecclesiastical¹ History, are much suspected by many learned men not to be genuine.

4. It is wonderful, that Eusebius should think ^k that Philo's Therapeutæ were Christians, and that ^l their ancient writings should be our gospels and epistles.

5. Eusebius ^m supposes, Josephus to speak of the enrolment at the time of our Lord's nativity, before the death of Herod the great, related Luke ii. 1—4. whereas indeed, the Jewish historian speaks of that made after the removal of Archelaus, which is also referred to in Acts v. 37.

6. Our author ⁿ does justly allege Josephus, as confirming the account which St. Luke gives, Acts xii. of the death of Herod Agrippa. But whereas Josephus says, that 'Agrippa' casting his eyes upwards saw an owl sitting upon a cord over his head: our ecclesiastical historian says, he *saw an angel over his head*. I know not, what good apology can be made for this.

7. He transcribes ^p Josephus's account of Theudas, as confirming what is said Acts v. 36. whereas what Josephus says is ^q

Et lis nulla foret. p. 4. F. Quæ ergo debent quæri? Quæ invenimus in scripturis posita. Quæ autem in scripturis non invenimus posita, ea non quæramus. Si enim oporteret nobis esse cognita, utique spiritus sanctus posuisset ea in scripturis. Non enim sumus sapientiores a spiritu sancto. p. 6. D. Vid. & G.

V. iii. p. 303, 305, 308.

13. p. 31—35.

53. & seq.

^m H. E. l. c. 5.

^o Josephus's account, with remarks, may be seen in Part i. of this work. B. i. ch. i. § vi.

^p L. ii. c. 11. ^q See Part i. of this work. B. ii. ch. vii.

ⁱ L. i. c.

^k L. ii. c. 17. p.

^l p. 55. D.

ⁿ L. ii. c. 10.

reckoned to be a considerable objection against the Evangelical History.

8. In the Demonstration he transcribes a passage of Josephus relating to the wonderful signs preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, and then adds, 'These' things he writes, as happening after our Saviour's passion: though they did not happen till above thirty years afterwards. To the like purpose in the 'Chronicle. And in 'the Ecclesiastical History Eusebius transcribes largely that passage of Josephus, as giving an account of the signs before the Jewish war. Concerning this matter may be seen" Joseph Scaliger.

9. If the testimony to Jesus, as the Christ, had been from the beginning, in Josephus's works, it is strange, it should never have been quoted by any ancient apologist for Christianity; and now in the beginning of the fourth century be thought so important, as to be quoted by our author in "two of his works, still remaining.

10. There is a * work, ascribed to Porphyry, quoted by Eusebius, in the Preparation, and Demonstration. If that work is not ' genuine, (as I think it is not) it was a forgery of his own time. And the quoting it, as he does, will be reckoned an instance of want of care, or skill, or candour and impartiality.

11. I formerly complained * of Eusebius, for not giving us at length the passage of Caius, concerning the scriptures of the New Testament, or however of St. Paul's epistles. But he abridged that, and afterwards transcribed at length several passages * of an anonymous writer of little worth, concerning the followers^b of Artemon. It may be reckoned somewhat probable, that Eusebius's aversion for Sabellianism, and every thing a-kin to it, led him to pay so much respect to that author.

12. I add no more at present. Many observations upon this author's works may be seen in Joseph Scaliger's Prolegomena to the Chronicle. Dr. Heumann intended^c to write remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History; but I do not know,

* Dem. Ev. l. viii. p. 402. D.

* Chr. p. 158. infr. m. † H. E.

l. iii. c. 8. † Prolegom. p. 12. m.

Et Animadv. in Euseb. p. 186. Vid. &

Van Dale de Orac. Diff. p. 39, 40.

* Hist. Ec. l. i. c. xi. Dem. Ev. l. iii.

p. 124. * Περὶ τῆς ἐκ λόγων φιλοσοφίας.

† Conf. Van Dale de Orac.

Diff. i. p. 14, 15. † See Vol. ii. p.

373 and 385.

* H. E. l. v. c. 28.

^b See those passages, with remarks upon them. Vol. ii. p. 379—385.

^c — alio tempore, si vita suppeditat, copiosum exhibiturus tibi judicium de Eusebii Historia Ecclesiastica, non perfundetur a me perfecta. Heumann, Epist. Miscell. T. ii. p. 25.

that

that he has published them: if he had, I should have read them with pleasure.

IV. It has been often disputed, whether Eusebius was an Arian. It may be proper therefore for me to refer to some authors upon this question. The ancients were not all of one mind here. Socrates, in the fifth century, inserted an Apology^d for him in his Ecclesiastical History.

Among moderns it is needless to mention Baronius, whose antipathy to this writer is well known. Petavius^e readily places Eusebius amongst Arians. Bull^f vindicates him. Cave^g and Le Clerc^h had a warm controversy upon this head. Cave allows, 'Thatⁱ there are many unwary and dangerous expressions to be found in his writings.' 'That^k he has at best doubtful and ambiguous expressions in this controverted doctrine:' 'and that^l he was reckoned to be an Arian by Athanasius, and divers others his contemporaries, as well as others in the latter part of the fourth century, and afterwards.' Still he says, he^m did not hold the peculiar doctrines of Arianism. Fabriciusⁿ and Du Pin^o do not much differ from Cave. Valesius^p too was favourable to our author. G. J. Vossius says, his^q works would sufficiently manifest him to have been an Arian, if the ancients had been silent about it. Of the same opinion was^r James Gothofred. Tillemont is clear, that^s Eusebius shewed himself an Arian by his actions and his writings. Montfaucon says the same thing^t exactly; and earnestly, and at large, argues on this side of the question; and that he shewed himself to be an Arian as much in his writings after the council of Nice, as before it. As for his subscribing the Nicene Creed, he supposes, that^u Eusebius was

^a L. ii. c. 21.^e Dogm. Theol.

iii. p. 43. a. f.

^m See note 1.

T. 2. l. i. cap. xi. xii.

^f Def. Fid.ⁿ Bib. Gr. T. vi. p. 32.^o Bib.Nic. ^g Lives of the Fathers, in

Ec. T. ii. p. 7.

^p Vid. de Vir. &

English. T. ii. & H. L. & Diss. tertia.

Scrip. Euseb. Cæs.

^q De Hist. Gr.

De Eusebii Cæsariensis Arianismo & Epist.

l. ii. c. 17.

^r Vid. Not. seu Dissert.

Apolog. ad calcem. H. L.

^h See Bib.

in Philostorg. lib. i. c. 8. p. 28. &c.

Univ. T. x. p. 379, &c. and Epistolæ Criticæ in the 3d vol. of his Ars Critica.

^s See Eusebius de Cæs. Art. xii. M. E.

T. vii.

^t Arianum probant tam gesta^u See Life of Eusebius, in English, § xxi. To the like purpose in the Diss. before referred to, p. 43. a. m. Oxon. — multa scriptis ejus inesse incautus, durius, periculosius dicta — sed hic pedem figo, hoc in me probandum recipio, Eusebium non fuisse Arianum.

quam scripta. Prælim. in Euseb. Comm.

in Pf. cap. vi. § 17.

^v Obijcere solent

qui Eusebii partes tutantur, ipsum in Synodo Nicæna τὴν ὁμολογίαν subscripsisse. —

Quare id non puto esse tanti ad ejus defensionem. Quid enim exoneratus metu fecisset, experiundi potestas non fuit. Id in Prælim. cap. vi. § 12. Ab exordio enim

Arianismi ad obitum usque cum Arius

concordissime vixit, nascenti hæresi non en

dedit; in Nicæna Synoda, quantum licuit,

^k Life of Eusebius, as before, § xxii. ^l In veteribus primas tenent Athanasius, Eustathius Antiochenus, Marcellus Ancyranus, Epiphanius, Hilarius, Hieronymus. &c. Diss.

moved by worldly considerations, and that he did not subscribe sincerely. Which is grievous to think: better had it been, that the bishops of that council had never met together, than that they should have tempted, and prevailed upon a Christian bishop, or any one else, to prevaricate, and act against conscience. Our blessed Lord has pronounced a woe upon those, by whom offences come. Matt. xviii. beg. And I am apt to think, that in the end his authority will be found superior to that of the most respected of his followers.

Pagi^u thought this to be a very difficult question.

I presume, it is not requisite, that I should deliver my own opinion; especially as I have not room to say what would be sufficient to the purpose: and in the writers already referred to, may be found very good observations.

I once suspected, that in examining this question, many learned men were under a bias. As Eusebius was so eminent a man, and well acquainted with the writings of primitive Christians, they might be unwilling to have it thought, that he held a different sentiment upon the doctrine of the Trinity from what they judged to be right. But now I am desirous to drop that surmise, and to allow, that there is some real difficulty in deciding this question: for surely there must be on both sides, men wise enough to guard against prejudice. However, in this I am clear, that the principles of religion may be learned from reason and scripture: and that we ought not to pay too much regard to any man's authority, how great soever he may be. For what Arnobius says gloriously of the Christian religion, may be said of every important truth: it^v trusts to its own evidence, and stands firm upon its own bottom; whether any man embrace it, or not.

V. This author was a witness of the sufferings of the Christians in the early part of his life; and afterwards saw the splendor of the church under the first Christian emperors. Like most other great men, he has met with good report, and ill report. His^x learning, however, and knowledge of the scrip-

Catholicis obliiit. Sed qui adprime calleret concedere temtori, demum cessit & subscripsit. Sic enim suadebat timor, non diuturni magister officii. Qua enim mente id egerit, sibi subditis populis sic enarravit, ut sibi pristina repetendi, sicubi liceret, aditum reliquerit. ib. § xvii.

^u Sed prorsus incertum, an Arianis vel orthodoxis annumerandus sit — Hankius refert — tandemque concludit, via tutissima videri illos incedere, qui post Synodum Nicænam

Eusebium Arianum fuisse, neque negantibus, neque affirmantibus accedentes, iudicium suum suspendunt. Tot ambagibus hæc quæstio intricata est! Pagi Ann. 325. n. xxxii.

^v Suis illis contenta est viribus, & veritatis propriæ fundaminiibus nititur: nec spoliatur vi sua, etiam nullum habeat vindicem. Arnob. l. iii. in.

^x — ἀντὶ τῶν θείων γραφῶν καὶ τῶν παρ' ἑλλήσι ποιούντων καὶ συγγραφεῶν πολυμαθέστατος ἴσως. Sozom. l. i. c. 1. p. 401. A.

tures,

tures, have been universally allowed. 'It appears from his 'works,' says Tillemont, 'that he had read all sorts of Greek 'authors, whether philosophers, historians, or divines, of 'Egypt, Phœnicia, Asia, Europe, and Africa.' With a very extensive knowledge of literature he seems to have had the agreeable accomplishments of a courtier. He was both a bishop, and a man of the world: a great author, and a fine speaker. He must have had a good education, though we have no particular account of it. We plainly perceive from his writings, that through the whole course of his life he was studious and diligent; insomuch, that it is wonderful, how he should have leisure to write so many large and elaborate works, of different kinds; beside the discharge of the duties of his function, and beside his attendance at court, at synods, and the solemnities of dedicating churches. He was acquainted with all the great and learned men of his time; and had access to the libraries at ^a Jerusalem, and ^a Caesarea: which advantages he improved to the utmost. Some may wish, he had not joined with the Arian leaders in the hard treatment that was given to Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, Athanasius of Alexandria, and Marcellus of Ancyra. But it should be considered, that the Christian bishops in general, after the conversion of Constantine, seem to have thought, that they had a right to depose and banish all ecclesiastics, who did not agree with them upon the points of divinity controverted at that time. Finally, though there may be some things exceptionable in his writings and conduct, I am persuaded, notwithstanding ^b what some may say, that he was a good, as well as great man. His zeal for the Christian religion, his affection for the martyrs, his grateful respects for his friend Pamphilus, his diligence in collecting excellent materials, and in composing useful works for the benefit of mankind, his ^c caution and scrupulousness in not vouching for the truth of Constantine's story of the apparition of the cross, as well as other things, fully satisfy me of this.

Du Pin ^{*} says, 'Eusebius seems to have been very disinterested, very sincere, a great lover of peace, of truth, and religion. Though he had close alliances with the enemies of 'Athanasius, he appears not to have been his enemy, nor to 'have had any great share in the quarrels of the bishops of 'that time. He was present at the councils, where unjust

^y Euseb. de Cæs. Art. i.

^z Vid.

rem admitteret. Montfaucon. Prælim. in

H. Ecc. l. vi. c. 20.

^a L. vi. c. 32.

Euseb. Comm. in PS. init.

^c See

^b — qui si quantum eruditionis, tantum sinceræ fidei laudem tulisset, vix pa-

before, p. 153, 154.

^{*} As before, p. 19.

‘ things were transacted against Eustathius and Athanasius;
 ‘ but we do not discern, that he shewed signs of passion him-
 ‘ self, or that he was the tool of other men’s passions. He
 ‘ was not author of new creeds. . . . he only aimed to reconcile
 ‘ and re-unite parties. He did not abuse the interest he had
 ‘ with the emperor to raise himself, nor to ruin his enemies,
 ‘ as did Eusebius of Nicomedia; but he improved it for the
 ‘ benefit of the church.’

VI. I have omitted many descriptions of the nature and design of the Christian religion, to be found in the primitive writers, proofs of their good sense, and just sentiments of religion. But I think it not proper to pass by every thing of that kind in this celebrated bishop of Cæsarea.

1. The title of the fourth chapter of the first book of the Ecclesiastical History is to this purpose: ‘ That the religion
 ‘ published by Jesus Christ to all nations, is neither new nor
 ‘ strange.’

‘ For though,’ says * he, ‘ without controversy, we are but
 ‘ of late, and the name of Christians is indeed new, and has
 ‘ not long obtained over the world; yet our manner of life,
 ‘ and the principles of our religion, have not been lately de-
 ‘ vised by us, but were instituted and observed, if I may so
 ‘ say, from the beginning of the world, by good men, accept-
 ‘ ed of God, from those natural notions which are implanted
 ‘ in men’s minds. This I shall shew in the following manner:
 ‘ It is well known, that the nation of the Hebrews is not new,
 ‘ but distinguished by its antiquity. They have writings con-
 ‘ taining accounts of ancient men; few indeed in number, but
 ‘ very eminent for piety, justice, and every other virtue. Of
 ‘ whom some lived before the flood, others since, sons and
 ‘ grandsons of Noah; particularly Abraham, whom the He-
 ‘ brews glory in as the father and founder of their nation.
 ‘ And if any one, ascending from Abraham to the first man,
 ‘ should affirm, that all of them who were celebrated for vir-
 ‘ tue, were Christians in reality, though not in name, he would
 ‘ not speak much beside the truth. For what else does the
 ‘ name of Christian denote, but a man, who by the knowledge
 ‘ and doctrine of Jesus Christ is brought to the practice of so-
 ‘ briety, righteousness, patience, fortitude, and the religious
 ‘ worship of the one and only God over all. About these
 ‘ things they were no less solicitous than we are; but they
 ‘ practised not circumcision, nor observed sabbaths, any more
 ‘ than we: nor had they distinctions of meats, nor other ordi-

* H. E. l. i. c. 4. p. 15. B. C. & 16.

‘ nances,

‘nances, which were first appointed by Moses.—Whence it is apparent, that ought to be esteemed the first and most ancient institution of religion, which was observed by the pious about the time of Abraham, and has been of late published to all nations, by the direction and authority of Jesus Christ.’

2. After the same manner, our author expresseth himself in the second chapter of the Evangelical Demonstration, published by Fabricius. ‘I have already shewn in the Evangelical Preparation, that Christianity is neither heathenism nor Judaism; but is a peculiar form of religion, neither new, nor absurd and unreasonable, but most ancient, observed by and well known to those who lived before Moses, who were dear to God, and renowned for piety and virtue. Nevertheless it will be proper here to shew briefly, what is heathenism, what Judaism. Judaism may be defined to be a republic established according to the law of Moses, subject to the one supreme God. As for heathenism, it may be said to be a superstition, consisting of the worship of many gods, according to the rites of several nations. What then shall we say of those men before Moses, and before Judaism, who were dear to God, of whom also Moses makes mention, as Enoch, to whom he bears testimony, that *he pleased God*. Gen. v. 22, 24. And Noah, of whom he says, *he was a just man in his generation*. Gen. vi. 9. And Seth and Japheth—And beside these, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and Job, and others, who followed the same course of life. Were they Jews or heathens? They cannot be said to have been Jews, since the law of Moses was not yet delivered.—Nor can they be reckoned heathens, since they were not involved in the superstition of polytheism.—Wherefore there must be a third religion, neither Judaism nor heathenism, the most ancient institution, and the most ancient philosophy, which has been lately declared to all men throughout the world. He therefore who forsakes Judaism or heathenism, and becomes a Christian, embraces that law and course of life, which had been followed by the ancient patriarchs, friends of God: which indeed had long lain dormant, but has been now revived by our Lord and Saviour, agreeably to the predictions of Moses, and the rest of the prophets.’

‘Vid. Fabric. de Verit. Relig. Christian. τις φιλοσοφία. κ. λ. ib. p. 14.

p. 11, 12, 13.

‘ — παλαιότητα ε — μακρον εφησυχασαία χροτον, αυθις ανανωσατο. ibid.

3. He expresseth himself again to the like purpose, in the fifth chapter of the same book of the Demonstration; where he observes, that the law of Moses was suited to the one nation of the Jews only, and them living in their own land. For it could not be obeyed by the Jews themselves in foreign and distant countries, much less by all nations of the earth. I say, having observed these things, he adds: 'The law and ^a course of life instituted by our Saviour Jesus Christ, is a revival of the ancient religion before Moses, according to which Abraham the friend of God, and others before him, lived.'

4. Again, in the Preparation he largely shews, 'That Abraham, and good men before him, had a freer and more rational religion than that of Moses, which contained ordinances about the sabbath, and annual festivals, and a multitude of rules about meats and drinks, and bodily purifications, troublesome to observe. The ^k ancestors of the Jews followed right reason, and were truly pious;' that is, I think, the patriarchal religion consisted of those principles and duties, which are reasonable in themselves, without a multitude of positive appointments; which too, undoubtedly, is the character of the Christian religion.

5. He elsewhere speaks of true religion, as the ^l divine philosophy: 'Jesus Christ,' he says, 'was ^m no impostor, but a philosopher, and truly religious.' Again, 'The ⁿ Christ of God is the saviour and enlightener of all nations, a teacher of piety, an example of sobriety, the captain of righteousness, the author of all virtue and right knowledge of God.'

6. Christ's apostles, when they went abroad to convert the world, did not conceal his inglorious death: but related that, as well as his miracles and ^o philosophical discourses. And through the doctrine ^p of Christ, the church of God all over the world has been taught to offer thanksgivings and reasonable services, without the smoke of burnt-offerings.

^b Τοῦτος δὲ πεφηνὲν ὁ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ νομοθετήματος νόμος τε καὶ βίος τὴν παλαιότητα καὶ πρεσβυτέραν μωσῆως εὐσεβείαν ἀνακηρυχόμενος. κ. λ. Dem. Ev. p. 9. C.

ⁱ Ἑβραῖοι δὲ πρεσβυτέροι μωσῆως — ἐλευθεροὶ καὶ ἀνεμίμνητοι εὐσεβείας καθάρθεν τροπῶν, βίῳ μὲν τῷ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν κεκοσμημένοι. Pr. Ev. l. vii. c. 6. p. 304. D.

^k — καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἐγγραφῶν αὐτῶν νόμων, πλεὺς ἤδη τῶν προπατορῶν ὁρθεῖς λογισμοί, εὐσεβείας ἀρίστη καλικομένησαν. ib. c. 7. p. 305. C.

^l — οἱ σωφρονεῖν τάχα μίτος, καὶ τὸν αὐτὴν βίον ἀναβίαια τῇ κατὰ θεοῦ φιλοσο-

φίᾳ. In Ps. p. 314. A. ^m — φιλοσοφὸς ἀρα, καὶ ἀληθῶς εὐσεβὴς πολλῶν δὲ πλεονος καὶ γοῆς, ὁμολοεῖται αὐτὸς ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν. Dem. Ev. l. iii. p. 127. A. ⁿ — σωτὴρ καὶ φῶς τῶν ἰσθμῶν ἀπαλίων, διδασκαλὸς εὐσεβείας, σωφροσύνης καθήκοντων, δικαιοσύνης ἀρχηγός, ἀρίστης ἀπάσης καὶ θιοφωσίας ἀληθῶς αἰσῆς. In Ps. p. 12. A. B. ^o — τὰς τε φιλοσοφίας διδασκαλίας αὐτῶν. Dem. E. l. iii. p. 137. D.

^p — ἐν οἷς — ἡ ἐκκλησία τῇ θεῷ τὰς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τὰς λογικὰς καὶ ἀκατήκτους λατρείας ἀναφέρει τῇ θεῷ παρεληφθεν. In Ps. p. 385. A.

7. He

7. He asserts free-will very strongly. He says, that ¹ right reason is given to men with a power to choose and act, according to the light and instruction afforded them, and thereby to intitle themselves to great recompences.

8. He says, ' that ' Christ gave like gifts to Judas with the ' other apostles : that once our Saviour had good hopes of him, ' on account of the power of free-will. For Judas was not of ' such a nature, as rendered his salvation impossible. Like ' the other apostles, he might have been instructed by the Son ' of God, and might have been a sincere and good disciple.'

9. He thinks, that ' by the law of the Lord, so much commended and extolled in the book of Psalms, may be meant the law of nature, binding all men.

10. His explication ¹ of Isa. lxiii. 1—6. deserves to be considered by the curious.

11. He seems to say, that Christ is our propitiation, as he has taught us to propitiate for ourselves, and expiate our sins by repentance and new obedience, only offering reasonable sacrifices. Commenting upon Psal. lxix. 31. ' In ^u like manner our Saviour says in the words before us, I offer not a ' sensible bullock, but a pure and unbloody sacrifice, which I ' have appointed in my church, to be offered by a ministry that ' has neither fire nor blood ; which will be more acceptable to ' God, than the bullock appointed by Moses. Therefore it ' is said, *I will magnify him with thanksgiving. This shall please ' the Lord more than a young bullock that has horns and hoofs.* ' And ^w indeed the high-priests, and the whole nation of the ' Jews would have obtained forgiveness, and the expiation of ' their sins, if embracing the new and salutary covenant, they ' had offered such a sacrifice.'

12. He does sometimes handsomely enumerate our Saviour's miracles ², related in the gospels.

¹ Τίλοι γὰρ ἀπάση ψυχῇ φυσικὸν νόμον
βέβαιον αὐτὴν καὶ συμμαχόν ἐπὶ τῶν πράξεων
ὅ τιν ὁδὸν ὁμιλεῖς ὑπερσταλο. Δια μὲν
τὴ νόμῳ τὴν εὐθείαν αὐτὴν παραδείξας ὁδὸν
διὰ δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς διδωρμένης ἀντιθέσεως ἐλευ-
θερίας τῆς τῶν κρείττωνων αἰρέσειν ἵπταιν καὶ
ἀποδοχῆς ἀξίαν ἀποφθνας, γέρων τι καὶ
μειζῶν ἵπαθλων. κ. λ. Pr. Ev. p. 250.
A. B. C. D. ² Ἐπειδὴ περὶ καὶ αὐτῶν
ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις τῶν ἰσῶν μι-
μεῖσθαι χάρισμάων. Ἐπιποιθεὶ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῶν ὁ
σῶτης, καὶ ἀθάνατος ἐκέν ἰλπίδας ἐπ' αὐτῶν,
διὰ το καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἀντιθέσεων. Οὐ γὰρ
τὴ φυσικῶς ἀδυνατῶν σπῆσθαι ἰσθῆς· ἀλλ'

οἷος τι, ἢ δὲ λησας, ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀ-
ποστόλοις μαθητευθῆναι τῷ Υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ
καλὸς καὶ ἀσφαλὲς μαθήτης ἀποδείκνυσθαι.
In Pf. p. 171. B. C.

² — εἴη
δ' ἂν νόμος κυρίου καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν πᾶσιν
ἀνθρώποις ἐνσπαρμένος. κ. λ. In Pf. i. p.

9. E. ³ In Isa. p. 581, 582.

⁴ In Pf. lxviii. p. 386. B. C. Vid. & p.

385. E. ⁵ Ἐλυχον δ' ἂν ἀφίστως καὶ
καθαρσῶς τῶν ἡμαρτημένων αὐτοῖς οἱ ἀρχι-
ερεῖς, καὶ οἱ τοῦ παλίου ἔθνους, εἰ κεχρησθε
ταύτῃ τῇ θυσίᾳ τῶν καινῶν καὶ σωτηρίῳ δια-
θήκῃ παραδείξαμενοι. ib. C.

⁶ Vid. Dem. Ev. l. iii. p. 107—109:

13. Eusebius has frequent occasion in his works, to observe the vast progress of the gospel in the world, which he does in a very agreeable manner, shewing how great a reformation it had made in the world, in respect to polytheism, idolatry, human sacrifices, polygamy, incestuous marriages, and every kind of dissoluteness. He speaks of the gospel's having been carried by the ⁷ apostles or their successors, not only to Rome, but into Persia, Armenia, Parthia, Scythia, India, Britain. So in one place. In another ² he mentions Persians, Scythians, Indians, Ethiopians, Moors, Spaniards, Britons. In another place he says, 'There is no ³ nation or kingdom, which does not in whole, or in part, acknowledge the glory of Christ.' In the third book of the Evangelical Demonstration, where he enlarges upon this subject, he says: 'When ⁴ I consider the power of this doctrine, and that great multitudes of men were persuaded, and numerous societies formed, by the mean and illiterate disciples of Jesus, and that not in obscure and ignorant places, but in the most celebrated cities, in Rome itself the queen of all other cities, in Alexandria, and Antioch, throughout Egypt and Lybia, Europe and Asia, and also in villages and country places, and in all nations; I am obliged, and even compelled to inquire after the cause of this, and to acknowledge, that they succeeded not in their great undertaking any otherwise, than by divine power surpassing all human ability, and the co-operation of him, who said unto them, *Go teach all nations in my name.*'

14. He seems to say, that ⁵ still in his time some miracles were done, but not many, nor of great notice. Yet afterwards he speaks of ⁶ Christians casting out dæmons in Christ's name. In another place, having spoken of the miracles related in the gospels, he adds: 'And ⁷ still through the doctrine of our Saviour Jesus Christ, men are delivered from the worship of dæmons, and from a blind and stupid respect for senseless idols, and obtain greater benefits than any bodily

⁷ Dem. Ev. l. iii. p. 112. D.

² In Pf. p. 570. A. B. Vid. ib. D.

³ Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἡκ ἱερός, ἢ βασιλεία, ἣ μὴ προσκυνεῖσα τὴν δοξάν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ ἀπομέρως. In Pf. p. 657. A.

⁴ Ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἀφορμὴν εἰς τὴν τοῦ λόγου δύναμιν, ὡς μυρία πλῆθη πεπεικεν, καὶ ὡς συνεστῶσαν μυριαδὸν ἐκκλησίαν πρὸς ἐκείνων τῶν ἐντελεσθέντων καὶ ἀφροικῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαθητῶν. κ. λ. Dem. Ev. l. iii. p. 138. B. C. D.

⁵ — Δὲ ὡς αἰεὶς ὁ κυριὸς ἡμῶν ἐστὶν

καὶ νῦν οἷς αὐτὸν κρίνειν μικρὰ τινα τῆς αὐτῆς δυνάμεως παραφανεῖν ἐνθάδε. Dem. Ev. l. iii. p. 109. A.

⁶ οὗτοί ἐσιν οἱ διὰ τοῦ πᾶσι δαίμων καὶ πανακαθάρτων πνεύμα — τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ἐνομα φησὶν. ib. p. 133. Vid. & p. 132. D.

⁷ Τέλειν ἀπαλίσαι, καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν παθῶν τι καὶ ἀφροισμῶν δια τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίας ἐστὶν καὶ νῦν ἀπαλλασθῆναι, πολὺν κρείττονας ἢ κατὰ σώμα ἰατρίας καὶ ψυχικῆς ἀξιωματικῆς. Dem. l. i. p. 301. D.

'cures.'

‘cures.’ Which, I think, seems to imply, that miracles were not then common, if they had not quite ceased.

15. He supposes, that ^f Peter and John, as well as Paul and other apostles, preached to several nations.

16. He says, all ^k the apostles suffered martyrdom; which, as ^h Montfaucon observes, cannot be shewn now.

17. In several places ⁱ he interprets Matt. v. 3. of worldly poverty.

18. I do not enter into the controversy, whether Eusebius was an Arian. Nevertheless, I shall transcribe the following passages, though they may seem to have some relation to it.

He speaks of the Spirit, as ^k made by the Son. Again, ‘The ⁱ Spirit is not of the Father, as the Son, but is one of the things made by the Son.’

He has some ways of speaking of the Son, that are remarkable: as, that ^m he was honoured with the Father’s deity. He says, ‘All ⁿ the Father’s grace was poured out upon the beloved: for it was the Father that spake in him.’

Again, upon Psal. lxxii. 1. ‘This ^o righteousness of the Father is given to the king’s son, of the seed of David according to the flesh; in whom, as in a temple, dwelled the word, and wisdom, and righteousness of God.’

Once more, referring to Isa. lxi. 1. and Luke iv. 18. ‘Shewing,’ says ^p he, ‘that his was not a bodily anointing, like that of others; but that he was anointed with the spirit of the Father’s deity, and therefore called Christ.’

The sense of these three last passages, taken from the Commentary upon the Psalms, falls in with the Nazarene, or Sabellian scheme. One might suspect, that they are not our author’s own; but that he borrowed them from some other writer, and inserted them in his work: which was a frequent method with Christian commentators.

^f Παυλος μὲν ἦν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κληρὸν — Πέτρος δὲ πάλιν ἱερὸν ἔθνην, καὶ Ἰωάννης ὡσαύτως ἱερὸν, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων ἕκαστος παρακλησιῶς. In Pf. p. 332. D. E. ^g In Pf. p. 413. B. C.

^h Prelim. cap. ix. n. iii. ⁱ Vid. in Pf. p. 386. C. D. 387. D. 404. D. E. & 412. B.

^k Οὗ δὲ Υἱοῦ μονοῦ πατρικῆς θεότητι τέλει μνημονεύειν ἀναγκαῖον ἐστὶν καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν — καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ τῆς παρακλητικῆς πνευματικῆς ὑπαρξίας. De Ec. Th. l. iii. c. 6. p. 174. C.

ⁱ Ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐκ τῆς Πατρὸς ομοιωσὶς τῷ Υἱῷ, καὶ αὐτὸ τῆς γενέσεως εἰληφέν· ἐν δὲ τῇ τῶν

διὰ τῆς Υἱοῦ γενομένης τυφλαίης. Ibid. p. 175. A. ^m Vid. note k.

ⁿ Ἐπεὶ δὲ τῆς ἀσπαρήνης πασῆς ἡ πατρικῆς εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐκινῶνται χάρις· ἢ γὰρ ὁ Παῖς λαλῶν ἐν Υἱῷ. In Pf. p. 188. D.

^o Αὕτη τοίνυν ἡ τῆς Πατρὸς δικαιοσύνη τῷ Υἱῷ τῆ βασιλείας διδόναι, τῷ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα· ἐν ᾧ κατέκνησεν ὡς περὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ τῆς Θεοῦ λόγος καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ δικαιοσύνη. In Pf. lxxi. p. 404. B.

^p Διδάσκων — τὸ δὲ πνευματικὸν τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος κειμήριον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Χριστὸν ἀντηφορευμένοι. In Pf. p. 634. E.

19. We must by all means take a fine passage of Eusebius in his Evangelical Demonstration; where, among many other just observations, proving the credibility of the gospel history, against 'those who refused to believe the accounts of the wonderful works done by our Saviour, he says: 'The' apostle 'Matthew does not pretend to any honourable station in the 'former part of his life; but placeth himself amongst publicans, 'employed in heaping up money. This none of the other 'evangelists have mentioned; not his fellow-disciple John, 'nor Luke, nor Mark. But Matthew is his own accuser, and 'dissembles not his former course of life. Observe then, how 'he expressly mentions his name in the gospel written by him- 'self: *And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man 'named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith 'unto him, follow me. And he arose and followed him. And it 'came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold many pub- 'licans came, and sat down with him and his disciples, Matt. ix.* '10. And afterwards in the course of the narration, inserting 'a catalogue of Christ's disciples, he calls himself the publican. 'For thus he says: *Now the names of the twelve apostles are 'these; the first Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his 'brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Phi- 'lip and Bartholomew; Thomas and Matthew the publican,* 'Ch. x. 2, 3. Thus Matthew out 'of abundance of modesty, 'hides not his former course of life: but ingenuously owns 'himself to have been a publican, and likewise placeth him- 'self after his colleague. For whereas they were joined two 'and two, he with Thomas, Peter with Andrew, and Philip 'with Bartholomew; he puts Thomas before himself, giving 'the preference to his fellow-apostle, as his superior; whilst 'the other evangelists have used a different order. Observe 'therefore Luke, how he mentions Matthew; he does not 'call him a publican, nor subjoin him to Thomas; but know- 'ing him to be his superior, first mentions him, and then Tho- 'mas, as does 'Mark likewise. The words of the former are 'these: *And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples, 'and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles; 'Simon, whom he named Peter, and Andrew his brother; James, 'and John; Philip, and Bartholomew; Matthew, and Thomas,* 'Luke vi. 13—15. Thus did Luke prefer Matthew, even as 'they had delivered things unto him, who from the beginning were

ἢ Προς τὴν ἀπειθυμίαν τῇ τῶν τοῦ σωτῆρος
 ἡμῶν περὶ τῶν παραδοξῶν πράξεων διήγησιν.
 Dem. Ev. l. iii. c. 5. p. 109. C.

ἢ Ibid. p. 119. D. — 122. A.

ἢ Δι' υπερβολῆς ἐπιεικειας. p. 120. B.

ἢ See Mark iii. 17, 18.

eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word, Ch. i. 2. You may observe John to be of the same mind with Matthew; for in his epistles, he either nameth not himself at all, or calls himself only elder, no where apostle, or evangelist. In his gospel, when he speaks of him whom Jesus loved, he does not mention himself by name. As for Peter, out^a of abundance of modesty, he thought not himself worthy to write a gospel; but^b Mark, who was his friend and disciple, is said to have recorded Peter's relations of the acts of Jesus: who, when he comes to that part of the history, where Jesus asked, who men said he was, and then, what opinion they themselves, his disciples, had of him? and Peter had replied, that they believed him to be the Christ; he does not relate any thing that Jesus said by way of answer to this, except that *he charged them, that they should tell no man of him*, Mark viii. 27—30. For Mark was not present to hear what Jesus said, and Peter did not think fit to bear testimony to himself, by relating what Jesus said to him, or of him. Nevertheless, what was said to him is related by Matthew in this manner: *But whom say ye, that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered, and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood has not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven*, Matt. xvi. 13, 16—19. Though such things were said to Peter by Jesus, Mark has taken no notice of them, because, as is probable, Peter^x did not relate them in his sermons. He only said, *When Jesus put the question to them, Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ. And he charged them, that they should tell no man of him*, Mark viii. 29, 30. About those things Peter thought fit to be silent; therefore Mark also has omitted them. But what concerned his denial [of Jesus], he^y preached to all men, because upon that account he *wept bitterly*. You will therefore find Mark relating concerning that matter all these several particulars. *And as Peter was in the palace, there*

^a— δι' ἐλαφείας υπερβολῆν. p. 120. D.
^b Τὸν Μάρκον γνωρίμος καὶ φίλῆς
 γινώσκων ἀπομνημονεύσαι λέγειται τὰς τῶ Πέ-
 τρου περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τῷ Ἰησοῦ διαλεξίαις.

Ibid.

p. 121. B. C.

^x Οὐ μὴδ' ὁ Πέτρος ταῦτ', ὡς
 εἶκος, ἐν ταῖς αὐτῆς διδασκαλίαις ἐξηγορεῖται.

^y ——— πρὸς πάντας

ἐκτελεῖν αὐτοῦ πρὸς πάντας. p. 121. C.

^c cometh

‘ cometh to him one of the maids of the high-priest. And when she
 ‘ saw Peter, she looked upon him, and said, And thou wast with
 ‘ Jesus of Nazareth. But he denied, saying, I know not, neither
 ‘ understand I what thou sayest: and he went out into the porch,
 ‘ and the cock crew. And a maid saw him again, and began to
 ‘ say to them that stood by, This is one of them. And he denied
 ‘ it again. And a little after they that stood by said again to Pe-
 ‘ ter, Surely, thou art one of them, for thou art a Galilean. But
 ‘ he began to curse and to swear, I know not this man, of whom
 ‘ ye speak. And the second time the cock crew, Mark xiv. 66—72.
 ‘ These things writes Mark: and ² Peter testifies these things
 ‘ of himself, for all things in Mark are said to be memoirs of
 ‘ Peter’s discourses.’

St. Matthew’s modesty in calling himself a publican, when the other evangelists did not, is taken notice of by ^a Jerom, upon several occasions, in his works.

20. This learned Christian apologist then proceeds to other like excellent observations, concerning the credibility of the evangelical history. But this may suffice, to shew the good sense of the ancient Christians: and that, as they diligently studied the scriptures, they were also able to make judicious remarks upon them. In short we may hence perceive, that the defence of the Christian religion was in fit hands. They had a good cause; and they shewed it to be so. They had truth on their side; and they demonstrated it by arguments, suited to convince reasonable and serious men.

VII. I must transcribe several passages of this author concerning the canon of scripture: and I shall begin with such as appear to be the most material.

1. The twenty-fourth chapter of the third book of the Ecclesiastical History is entitled, Of ^b the order of the Gospels. It must be alleged here almost entire, only first observing, that in the preceding chapter Eusebius had inserted a particular relation concerning St. John, from Clement of Alexandria. ‘ Let us,’ says he, ‘ observe the writings of this apostle,

^a Πίρος δι ταύτα περι ταύτη μαρτυρί. Πάντα γὰρ τὰ παρὰ Μάρκω τὴ Πίρῳ δια-
 λεξίῳ εἶναι λεγέσθαι απομνημονεύματα. p.
 128. A. ^a Cæteri Evangelistæ in
 conjunctione nominum primum ponunt
 Matthæum, & postea Thomam. Nec pub-
 licani nomen ascribunt, ne antiquæ con-
 versationis recordantes suggillare Evange-
 listam viderentur. Ille vero, ut supra
 diximus, & post Thomam se ponit, & pub-
 licanum appellat. Hieron. ad Matt. cap.

x. Tom. iv. P. i. p. 34. f.

Quod quidem & de Matthæo Evangelista
 legimus, quod ipse Matthæus se dixerit
 publicanum: alii vero Evangelistæ no-
 men publicani tacuerint, & apostolicam tan-
 tum posuerunt dignitatem: & quod in
 conjunctionibus Apostolorum, apud se, se-
 cundus, apud alios primus sit. Id. in 11.
 cap. xxxvii. T. iii. p. 338.

^b Πίρῳ
 τῆς ταξίως τῶν ἐναγγελιστῶν. p. 94. A.

‘ which

‘ which ^e are not contradicted by any. And first of all must
 ‘ be mentioned, as acknowledged of all, the gospel according
 ‘ to him, well known to all the churches under heaven. And
 ‘ that it has been justly placed by the ancients the fourth in
 ‘ order, and after the other three, may be made evident in
 ‘ this manner. Those admirable and truly divine men, the
 ‘ apostles of Christ, eminently holy in their lives, and as to
 ‘ their minds adorned with every virtue, but *rude* ^d in lan-
 ‘ guage, confiding in the divine and miraculous power bestowed
 ‘ upon them by our Saviour, neither knew, nor attempted,
 ‘ to deliver the doctrine of their master with the artifice and
 ‘ eloquence of words. But using only the demonstration of
 ‘ the Divine Spirit working with them, and the power of
 ‘ Christ performing by them many miracles, they spread the
 ‘ knowledge of the kingdom of heaven all over the world.
 ‘ Nor were they greatly concerned about the writing of books,
 ‘ being engaged in a more excellent ministry, which was above
 ‘ all human power. Insomuch that Paul, the most able of
 ‘ all in the furniture both of words and thoughts, has left
 ‘ nothing in writing, beside ^e some very ^f short [or a very few]
 ‘ epistles: although he was acquainted with innumerable mys-
 ‘ teries, having been admitted to the sight ^g and contemplation
 ‘ of things in the third heaven, and been caught up into the
 ‘ divine paradise, and there allowed to hear unspeakable words.
 ‘ Nor were the rest of our Saviour’s followers unacquainted
 ‘ with these things, as the seventy disciples, and many other,
 ‘ beside the twelve apostles. Nevertheless of all the disciples
 ‘ of our Lord, Matthew and John only have left us any me-
 ‘ moirs: who too, as we have been informed, were compelled
 ‘ to write by a kind of necessity. For Matthew having first
 ‘ preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to other
 ‘ people, delivered to them in their own language the gospel
 ‘ according to him, by that writing supplying the want of
 ‘ his presence with those whom he was then leaving. And
 ‘ when Mark and Luke had published the gospels according
 ‘ to them, it is said, that John, who all this while had preached
 ‘ by word of mouth, was at length induced to write for this
 ‘ reason. The three first written gospels being now delivered
 ‘ to all men, and to John himself, it is said, that he approved
 ‘ them, and confirmed the truth of their narration by his own
 ‘ testimony:’ saying, ‘ there was only wanting a written ac-

^e — ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων. ^d Τῆς δὲ γλώττης p. 94. D.

^f — ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων. p. 94. C. Confer. 2 Cor. xi. 6. Origen, in a passage formerly cited, Vol.

^g — πλεον τῶν βραχυλογίῶν περιελαβὼν. ii. p. 466.

^f See to the like purpose

^g See 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3, 4.

count of the things done by Christ in the former part, and the beginning of his preaching. And certainly that observation is very true. For it is easy to perceive, that the other three evangelists have recorded only the actions of our Saviour for one year after the imprisonment of John, as they themselves declare at the beginning of their history. For after mentioning the forty days fast, and the succeeding temptation, Matthew shews the time of the commencement of his account in these words: *When^h he had heard, that John was cast into prison, he departed out of Judea into Galilee.* In like manner Mark, *Nowⁱ after that John, says he, was cast into prison, Jesus came into Galilee.* And Luke, before he begins the account of the acts of Jesus, gives a like hint in this manner: that *Herod added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison.* For these reasons, as is said, the apostle John was^l intreated to relate in the gospel according to him, the time omitted by the former evangelists, and the things done by our Saviour in that space, before the imprisonment of the Baptist. And they add farther, that he himself hints as much, saying, *This^m beginning of miracles did Jesus:* as also, when in the history of the acts of Jesus he makes mention of the Baptist, as still *baptizing in Aenon, nigh unto Salim.* And it is thought, that he expressly declares as much, when he says, *For John was not yet cast into prison.* John therefore in the gospel according to him, relates the things done by Christ, while the Baptist was not yet cast into prison. But the other three evangelists relate the things that followed the Baptist's confinement. Whoever attends to these things, will not any longer think the evangelists disagree with each other: soasmuch as the gospel according to John contains the first actions of Christ, whilst the others give the history of the following time. And for the same reason, John has omitted the genealogy of our Saviour according to the flesh, it having been recorded before by Matthew and Luke: but he begins with his^p divinity, which had been reserved by the Holy Ghost for him, as^q the more excellent person. This is as much as needs to be said of the gospel according to John. What was the occasion of writing the gospel according to Mark, has been already^r shewn. Luke at the beginning assigns the reason

^h Matt. iv. 12.ⁱ Mark i. 14.^p — Θεολογίας. p. 96. B.^k Luke iii. 19, 20.^l Παρακληθείς^q Οία κριτοῦ. ib.^r Vid. Euseb.

δὴ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ φησὶ τὸν ἀποστόλον Ἰωάννην.

H. E. l. ii. c. 15. And see before in this

p. 95. D.

^m John ii. 11.

work, Vol. ii. p. 210.

^a lb. iii. 23.^o lb. vcr. 24.

‘ of his writing; declaring, that whereas many others had
 ‘ rashly undertaken to give a relation of the matters which he
 ‘ most surely believed; he thought himself obliged, in order
 ‘ the better to divert us from the uncertain relations of others;
 ‘ to deliver in his gospel a certain account of those things,
 ‘ which he was well assured of, from his intimate acquaintance
 ‘ and familiarity with Paul, and his conversation with the other
 ‘ apostles. And thus much now concerning these things: at
 ‘ a more proper season, we shall endeavour to shew by quota-
 ‘ tions of ancients, what has been said of the same by others.
 ‘ But farther, as to the writings of John, beside the gospel,
 ‘ the first epistle is universally acknowledged, both by those of
 ‘ the present time, and by the ancients. But the other two
 ‘ are contradicted. Concerning the Apocalypse there are to
 ‘ this very day different opinions: this controversy likewise
 ‘ will be decided in a proper time, by the testimony of the
 ‘ ancients.’

2. The title of the next chapter is, Of the Scriptures uni-
 versally acknowledged, and those that are not such.

‘ But,’ says Eusebius, ‘ it will be proper to enumerate here
 ‘ in a summary way’, the books of the New Testament which
 ‘ have been already mentioned. And in the first place are to
 ‘ be ranked the sacred four gospels: then the book of the Acts
 ‘ of the apostles: after that are to be reckoned the epistles of
 ‘ Paul. In the next place, that called the first epistle of John,
 ‘ and the [first] epistle of Peter, are to be esteemed “authentic.”
 ‘ After these, is to be placed, if it be thought fit, the Reve-
 ‘ lation of John, about which we shall observe the different
 ‘ opinions at a proper season. Of the controverted, but “yet
 ‘ well known or approved by the most [or many], are that
 ‘ called the epistle of James, and that of Jude, and the second
 ‘ of Peter, and the second and third of John; whether they
 ‘ are written by the evangelist, or another of the same name.
 ‘ Among the spurious are to be placed the Acts of Paul, and
 ‘ the book intitled the Shepherd, and the Revelation of Peter:
 ‘ and beside these, that called the Epistle of Barnabas, and the
 ‘ book * named the Doctrines of the Apostles. And more-
 ‘ over, as I said, the Revelation of John, if it seem meet;
 ‘ which some, as I have said, reject, others reckon among the
 ‘ books universally received. Among these † also some have

‘ L. iii. c. 25. p. 97. ‘ — της πολλοις. — p. 97. B. x — και
 τους διαβηκους γραφας. p. 97. A. των αποστολων αι λεγομεναι διδαχαι. ib. C.
 * — κεραιων. p. 97. B. † των † — ηδη δ’ εν τωτοις τινες και το καθ’
 † αποδεχονται, γινωσκων δ’ οτι οτως τοις Εβραιωις ευαγγελιστοι καλεειζαν. C.

‘reckoned the gospel according to the Hebrews, which the
 ‘Hebrews who have embraced Christ * make use of. All
 ‘these may be reckoned controverted. It was however need-
 ‘ful, that I should put down a catalogue of these also; dis-
 ‘tinguishing * the scriptures, which according to the ecclesi-
 ‘astical tradition are true, genuine, and universally acknow-
 ‘ledged, from those others, which are not placed in the [New]
 ‘Testament, but are controverted, and yet appear to have
 ‘been known to many: that by this means we may know
 ‘these from such as have been published by heretics, under
 ‘the names of apostles: as ^b containing the Gospels of Peter,
 ‘and Thomas, and Matthias, and of some others; and the
 ‘Acts of Andrew and John, and other apostles. Which books
 ‘none of the ecclesiastical writers in the succession [of the
 ‘apostles,] have vouchsafed to make any mention of in their
 ‘writings. The style also of these books is intirely different
 ‘from that of the apostles: moreover the sentiments and doc-
 ‘trine of those pieces are different from the true orthodox
 ‘Christianity. All which things plainly shew, that those books
 ‘are the forgeries of heretics. For all which reasons, they are
 ‘not so much as to be reckoned among the spurious, but are
 ‘to be rejected, as altogether absurd and impious.’

This is an obscure chapter: certainly, with a little more care, Eusebius might have expressed himself in a clearer manner. However, we defer our remarks, until we have seen some more passages.

3. The third chapter of the same third book of the Ecclesiastical History is intitled, Of the Epistles of the Apostles; and is to this purpose:

‘One epistle then of Peter, called his first, is universally
 ‘received. This ^c the presbyters [or elders] of ancient times
 ‘have quoted in their writings, as undoubtedly genuine. But
 ‘that called his second epistle, we have been informed, [that
 ‘is, by the same tradition of the elders:] has not been re-
 ‘ceived ^d into the [New] Testament. Nevertheless, appear-
 ‘ing to many to be useful, it has been carefully studied with
 ‘the other scriptures. But the book entitled his Acts, and
 ‘that called the gospel according to him, and that styled his
 ‘Preaching, and the Revelation under his name, we know

² — α — καιροισι. C.

³ — δια-
 κριναι τις τας τι καλα την εκκλησιαστικην
 παραδοσιν αληθεις και απλαγης και ανω-
 μολεσιμιας γραφας, και τας αλλας παρα-
 ταυλας, ηκ ενδιαβηκης μεν, αλλα και αντι-
 λεξιμιας: ομως δε παρα πολλοις των εκ-

κλησιαστικων γινωσκομεναι. C. D.

^b — περιεχουσας. Ib. D.

^c Ταυτη δε και οι παλαι προεβληθη
 κ. λ. p. 71. C. ^d — ηκ ενδιαβη-
 κειν ιωαν παριλαβειν. p. 72. A.

‘ they

they have not been delivered down to us in the number of catholic writings: forasmuch as no ecclesiastical writer of the ancients, or of our time, has made use of testimonies out of them. But in the progress of this history we shall make it our business to shew, together with the successions [from the apostles,] what ecclesiastical writers in every age have used such writings as these which are contradicted: and what they have said with regard to the scriptures received into the New Testament, and acknowledged by all, and with regard to those which are not such. These then are the writings ascribed to Peter, of which I know of but one epistle only, that is genuine, and acknowledged by the presbyters of former times. Of Paul there are fourteen [epistles] manifest and well known. But yet there are some who reject that to the Hebrews, urging for their opinion, that it is contradicted by the church of the Romans, as not being Paul's. What has been said of this epistle by those who were before us, I shall shew in due time. Nor have I understood the book called his Acts, to be placed among unquestioned scriptures. But whereas the apostle himself, in his salutations at the end of the epistle to the Romans, makes mention among others also of Hermas, who, it is said, is the author of the small book called the Pastor; it ought to be observed, that it is contradicted by some: for whose sake it cannot be placed among those books which are universally received. But by others it has been judged a most necessary book, especially for those who are to be instructed in the rudiments of religion. For which reason it is still, as we know, publicly read in the churches; and I have observed it quoted by some very ancient writers. This may suffice for an account of the divine scriptures, both those which are unquestioned, and those which are not received by all.

This chapter too is inaccurate: nor does it answer the title. Eusebius does not here speak of all the epistles of apostles, not of all such as were universally received. But we proceed to the next chapter, which perhaps may supply the defects of this.

^c — οποιαις χειρηται των ανηλεστο-
μων: τια τε περι των ενδιαθων και
εμολογητων γραφων, και οσα περι των μη
τοιων αυτοις ειρηται. p. 72. B.

^f Τε δε Παυλη προδηλοι και σαφεις αι
δικαισσαιρες: οτι γε μη τινες ηδηκασι την
προς Εβραιους, προς της ρωμαίων εκκλησιας
ως με Παυλη νσαν αυτην ανηλεισθαι φη-
σαις, η δικαιοι αβουιν. Ib. B. C.

^g Οθεν ηδη και εν εκκλησιας ισμεν αυτω
δεδημοσιουμενον. Ib. B.

^d Ταυτα εις
παρασασιν των τε αναληρητων και των μη
παρασασιν ομολογητων θειων γραμματων,
ειρησθω. Ib. D.

ⁱ The titles were
composed by Eusebius himself, and pre-
fixed by him to the several chapters of this
work, as we now have them. So Valefius
in his Annotations, p. 1.

4. The fourth chapter of the same third book of the Ecclesiastical History is entitled, Of the first succession of the Apostles. I shall transcribe at large what has here also any relation to our present design, assuring us of the genuineness of St. Luke's two books, the gospel and Acts of the apostles, St. Peter's first epistle, and some other things.

Moreover, that Paul in the course of his preaching to the Gentiles, laid the foundation of the churches *from* ^k *Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum*, is manifest both from his own words, and from what Luke has related in the ^l Acts. In like manner, in what provinces Peter preaching the gospel of Christ to those of the circumcision, delivered the doctrine of the new covenant, is evident from his own words in that epistle of his, which, as we have said, is universally acknowledged, and is inscribed by him to the Hebrews *scattered throughout Pontus, and Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia*. But how many, and who of these were genuine followers of the apostles, and approved of as fit for the pastoral office in the churches they had planted, is not easy to say, excepting such as may be collected from Paul's own words. For he had a vast number of fellow-labourers, and, as he calls them, fellow-soldiers: many of whom are secured of everlasting remembrance by the immortal testimony he has given to them in his epistles. And besides, Luke in the Acts has mentioned them by name among the disciples of the apostle. However it is said, that Timothy was the first bishop of the church in Ephesus, and Titus of the churches in Crete. And Luke, who was of Antioch, and by profession a physician, for the most part a companion of Paul, who had likewise more than a slight acquaintance with the rest of the apostles, has left us in two books divinely inspired, evidence of the art of healing souls, which he had learned from them. One of these is the gospel, which he professeth to have written as ^m *they delivered it to him, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word*: with all whom, he says likewise, he had been *perfectly acquainted from the very first*. The other is the Acts of the apostles, which he composed now, not from what he had received by the report of others, but from what he had seen with his own eyes. And it is said, that Paul was wont to refer to the gospel according to him, whenever in his epistles speaking as it were of some gospel of his own he says: *According* ⁿ *to my*

^k Rom. xv. 19.

^l See the Acts, from ch. xiii. to xxi.

^m Luke i. 2, 3.

ⁿ 2 Tim. ii. 8.

^o *gospel.*

gospel. Of the rest of the followers of Paul, Crescens^o is said by himself to have been sent *into Gaul* [or Galatia]. And Linus, whom he speaks of in^p his second epistle to Timothy, as being with him at Rome, was appointed to the bishopric of the church of Rome, next after Peter, as was before mentioned. And moreover Clement, who was appointed the third bishop of Rome, is also mentioned by Paul himself, as^q his fellow-labourer and fellow-soldier. And beside all these is the Areopagite, named Dionysius: whom Luke in the^r Acts relates to have become a believer immediately after Paul's speech to the Athenians at the Areopagus: who is also said by another Dionysius, pastor of the church of Corinth, one of the ancients, to have been the first bishop of the church at Athens.

VIII. Thus I have put down four chapters of our ecclesiastical historian almost entire. I think, I need not transcribe any more at length; but we may have occasion to observe hereafter divers other particular passages. At present we make a stand, to review what we have seen.

1. These passages are to be understood, chiefly, as representing the opinions of Christians in the time of our author.

2. It seems evident from what Eusebius writes, that there was not then^a any canon of scripture, or catalogue of the books of the New Testament established by any authority, which was universally acknowledged by Christians. Our historian does not mention any such thing. And besides, this is so apparent from different opinions here observed, that I think it needless to insist on a particular demonstration of the truth of this remark.

3. The method which Eusebius himself, and others of his time, made use of in judging concerning the sacred authority of any books, was to inquire after, and consider the testimony of the ancients, those holy and venerable Christians whether bishops or others of former times, who lived near the age of the apostles. This is a method, of which we have seen many instances in authors before cited, and we observe it also in these passages of Eusebius. However, as to books of doubtful authority, which had not been much quoted by the ancients, they did likewise examine their style and doctrine, and compare the things contained in them with the doctrine, design and manner of the books universally owned to be of divine and apostolical authority.

^a 2 Tim. iv. 10. p — ver. 21.

^q Philip. iv. 3. ^r Acts xvii. 34.

^p To the like purpose Basnage, who de-

serves to be consulted. Hist. de l'Eglise, l. viii. c. 5. n. 9, 10, 11.

4. In these passages of Eusebius are observable several sorts of books: but how many sorts may need some consideration. Valefius[†] has a learned note upon one of the forecited passages, the substance of which is: 'That there are three sorts of sacred books, such as are universally received, such as are doubted of by some, and lastly, such as are universally rejected, or plainly spurious. But,' says he, 'Eusebius, and some other ancients, use the word spurious improperly for books that are only of doubtful authority, and controverted by some: whereas by spurious ought to be intended those which are really so, as having been forged by heretics, such as are mentioned at the end of that chapter. For, to speak properly, there are but two sorts of sacred books; those universally received, and those doubted of, or contradicted by some: and the spurious ought not to be reckoned among sacred books.' So that learned writer.

In order to judge of this matter, and the better to understand Eusebius, it will be very convenient to observe another passage, not yet transcribed. 'Thus far,' says he, 'of what is come to our knowledge concerning the apostles, and the apostolical times, and the sacred writings which they have left us, as also of those that are contradicted, but yet are publicly used [or read] in most churches, and of such as are altogether spurious, and far different from the apostolical doctrine.'

Here are three sorts of books expressed, with a fourth implied. For if some are altogether spurious, others may be called spurious simply.

It seems to me, that when we speak of books, and rank them according to the several opinions which men have of them, there may be five sorts: 1. Such as are universally received. 2. Such as are very generally received, and are doubted of by a few only. 3. Such as Eusebius calls controverted, or contradicted: which are received by many, or the most, but yet are doubted of by a good number of people. 4. Such as are received by a few only, or however are rejected by more than they are received. These Eusebius may call spurious. 5. There are such as are universally rejected by catholic Christians, as not having been used by any of the ancients, as books of any value, and containing things contrary to the true apostolical

[†] Annot. in libr. iii. c. 25. p. 52, 53.

^u — αν τε καὶ ἀδελφότητιν ἡμῶν ἱερῶν
γραμμάτων, καὶ ἀνελθόμενοι μετ' οὐκ ἔν
ἐκείναις ἐκκλησίαις κατὰ πολλοὺς δεῖν

μοσιευμένων, τῶν τε πάντως ἰσθῶν, καὶ
τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἐκδοξίας ἀλλότριον. —
L. iii. c. 31. p. 103. B.

doctrine. These are altogether or throughout spurious. If I mistake not, four of these sorts appear plainly in the second passage cited from Eusebius: I mean all, except the second sort: and perhaps we may find, that neither has that been quite neglected by him. We shall now go over these several sorts and divisions.

1.) There were books of scripture universally received, and acknowledged by all the churches of Christ, or all catholic Christians, as sacred and divine. The books of this sort, mentioned by Eusebius, are the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, thirteen epistles of Paul, one epistle of Peter, one epistle of John.

2.) There were books very generally received, and doubted of by a few only. This division is not distinctly made, or expressly named by Eusebius: but, as I observed, it is a very reasonable division, when there is a number of books, about which there are different opinions. It may then very well happen, that there shall be some of this sort. I think, we may not improperly place here the epistle to the Hebrews, and the book of the Revelation; or at least the former of these. For at the beginning of the second passage, Eusebius placeth the epistles of Paul among books universally received; without making there, or in any other part of that passage, any exception for the epistle to the Hebrews. In the third passage he says: 'Of Paul there are fourteen epistles manifest and well known. But yet there are some who reject that to the Hebrews, urging for their opinion, that it is contradicted by the church of the Romans, as not being St. Paul's.' Or, as we may remember, upon another occasion our author said: 'To this very time, by some of the Romans, this epistle is not reckoned to be the apostle's.' However, it must be allowed, that there were some beside the Romans, who did not receive this epistle as Paul's. So he said in the words before cited: 'But yet there are some who reject that to the Hebrews, urging for their opinion, that it is contradicted by the church of Rome.' These are not Romans. And doubtless we may observe some other passages of Eusebius, where the epistle to the Hebrews is reckoned among controverted, or contradicted books. Nevertheless, I think, he seems here inclined to give this epistle a place among those books which were very generally received. We may therefore suppose, that it was more generally received in the churches, with which

Eusebius was best acquainted, than the disputed catholic epistles.

As for the Revelation, at the end of our first passage Eusebius says: 'There are concerning that book to this very day different opinions.' At the beginning of our second passage he says: 'After these [universally received,] is to be placed, if it be thought fit, the Revelation of John, concerning which we shall observe the different opinions at a proper time. These are books received with a general consent.' But yet afterwards, in the same passage, reckoning up the books called spurious, he adds: 'And moreover, as I said, the Revelation of John, if it seem meet: which some, as I have said, reject, others reckon among the books universally received.'

I am not positive: I only propose it to be considered, whether, dividing books according to the several opinions of people in Eusebius's time, these two, the epistle to the Hebrews and the Revelation, may not be placed in the rank next after those universally received.

3.) There are books which may be called controverted, or contradicted: which are received by many, or the most, but yet are doubted of by a good number of people. This is the second class, expressly mentioned in the second passage from Eusebius. For after the mention of those universally received, he adds: 'Of the controverted, but yet well known and approved by the most, are that called the epistle of James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and the second and third of John: whether they were written by the evangelist, or by another of that name.'

These are the books which in that passage Eusebius calls controverted, and says, they were 'approved of by the most, or many.'

We may allow this to be in the general a just representation of the sentiments of Christians at that time concerning those epistles. However, there are some other passages relating to them to be observed.

In the second book of our author's Ecclesiastical History is a long chapter about the death of James, called the Just, and

* The argument above is confirmed by an observation of Mr. Robert Turner, in his Discourse of the pretended Apostolical Constitutions, p. 71. 'It is plain, Eusebius was at a loss, in what class to fix the Apocalypse: so that when he annexes it to the *ομολογημένα*, it is with an *επειδή*. And he does the same, when he

" joins it to the *σοβα*, adding: — which some reject as spurious, and others receive as confessedly sacred and canonical." If Eusebius was at a loss, in which of the classes expressly mentioned by him he should place the Revelation; it is likely, that it may belong to what I call the second class, which he has not expressly mentioned.

the brother of our Lord. Eusebius having exhibited two accounts of this person's death, one taken from the fifth book of the Memoirs of Hegesippus, the other from the Antiquities of Josephus, concludes the chapter with these words: 'Thus' 'far concerning this James, who is said to be author of the' 'first of the seven epistles called catholic. But it ought to be' 'observed, that it is spurious: forasmuch as there are not' 'many of the ancients, who have made mention of it; as' 'neither of that called Jude's, which likewise is one of the' 'epistles called catholic. However, we know that these also' 'are commonly used [or publicly read], in most churches,' 'together with the rest.'

This passage shews us, that there were seven epistles called catholic: five of these, as we saw before, were controverted, two of which are here mentioned. Of these seven epistles, that of James was placed first in order: though there were doubts about some of them, yet in many churches all seven were joined together, and the five controverted epistles were publicly used and read with the rest.

The words concerning the epistle of James, which I have translated in this manner, 'but it ought to be observed, that' 'it is spurious;' are by Valesius rendered thus, 'which some' 'esteem spurious and supposititious.' And in his notes he says, that Rufinus and Christopherson have translated those words in the same manner, as representing the opinions of men concerning that epistle: which sense he owns he had followed in his version. But he says, upon farther consideration, he had altered his mind: and he thinks, that Eusebius there declares his own sentiment, and pronounceth this epistle absolutely spurious.

But I rather think, that Eusebius in those words declares the opinion of men about that epistle; and says, that it is contradicted, or rejected, by a good number of people, as was also the epistle of Jude. This appears to me the meaning of the expression: however, I have translated literally, and leave every one to judge of the words. We shall by and by distinctly consider Eusebius's own sentiments about this epistle; and then, perhaps, some things may offer for farther clearing up the meaning of this place.

As there are some other passages, in which Eusebius speaks of controverted books, they ought to be placed here.

ἢ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ονομαζομένων κατὰ αὐτὴν ἐκδημοκρεσάντων — οὐκ ἔστιν ἰσχυρὴ καὶ
 ἐκείνων ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λεγέσθαι. ἵσταται δὲ ὡς
 κινεῖσθαι μὲν ἡ πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν παλαιῶν
 ταύτας μάλιστα πᾶν λοιπὸν ἐκ παλαιῆς διδασκαλίας
 μυστηριαστικῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς. l. ii. c. 23. p. 66. C.

In one place he says, 'That ^a Clement in his Stromata takes ^a testimonies out of those scriptures ^a that are contradicted; as the Wisdom of Solomon, the book of Jesus the son of Sirach, and the epistle to the Hebrews, and the epistle of Barnabas, and Clement, and Jude.'

And soon after he observes of the same Clement of Alexandria, 'that ^b in his Institutions, to speak briefly, he gives ^b short explications ^c of all the canonical scriptures, not ^c omitting those that are contradicted: I mean the epistle of Jude, and the other catholic epistles, and the epistle of Barnabas, and the book called the Revelation of Peter.'

I scarce need to say, that by contradicted, Eusebius means books doubted of, or controverted by some, or many. But the books ranked in this class, and of which he useth that phrase, are not equally contradicted: some might be rejected by more than others were. Certainly, the Revelation of Peter, here placed among contradicted scriptures, was not received by so many as the epistle to the Hebrews, or those catholic epistles that were controverted. So far of this sort of books. We proceed,

4.) The next are those called spurious by our author: simply so, not altogether spurious. By those called spurious, I suppose to be meant such as were received by a few only; or however, were rejected by more, many more than they were received. Of these Eusebius speaks in our second passage from him after this manner: 'Among ^e the spurious are to be placed ^e the Acts of Paul, and the book intitled the Shepherd, and ^e the Revelation of Peter; and beside these, that called the ^e epistle of Barnabas, and the book named the Doctrines of ^e the Apostles: and moreover, as I said, the Revelation of ^e John, if it seem meet; which some, as I have said, reject, ^e others reckon among the books universally received. Among ^e these also some have reckoned the Gospel according to the ^e Hebrews, which the Hebrews who have embraced Christ ^e make use of. All ^f these may be reckoned controverted.'

Hereby I think Eusebius intends to signify, that these books [called by him spurious], were not so generally received, as those before mentioned in that passage, and called distinctly contradicted, namely, the five disputed catholic epistles. They were received by some, but were rejected by many, by much

^a See before, Vol. ii. p. 210, 211.

^a — απο των ανηλισκομενων γραφων. H. E. l. 6. c. 13. p. 214. D. before, Vol. ii. p. 211.

215. C.

μετας παρελθον. ibid.

βοις καθ'αλληλαχθω. κ. λ. p. 97. B.

^c — πα- ^f Ταυτα μεν παλαια των ανηλισκομενων εσ- ηη. ib. C.

the greater part of catholic Christians in Eusebius's time, as not having been quoted by many of the ancients, as books of authority; or, as not thinking them so excellent for the matter, as those universally received; or, as not written by the authors to whom they were ascribed; or, if really written by the persons whose names they bore, yet thinking, that the writings of those persons ought not to be reckoned canonical, or placed in the New Testament. This I take to be the case of several of the books here mentioned: the book called the Shepherd, might be allowed to be written by Hermas; and the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas, might be really his: but these pieces might not be judged fit to be received into the New Testament, the authors not being apostles. This too, I take to be one reason of placing here the Revelation of John; because many thought it not written by John the apostle, but by some other of that name: though some of those who rejected this book, might likewise have exceptions to some of the contents of it; as also to some things contained in the two other writings just mentioned.

5.) The fifth sort of books are such as were supposed to be published by heretics, under the names of apostles, which in the second passage are said to be these, 'The Gospels of Peter, and Thomas, and Matthias, and some others; and the Acts of Andrew, and John, and other apostles.' The reasons why these were rejected are assigned by Eusebius at large. He concludes, that 'they are the forgeries of heretics, and* that 'they are not so much as to be reckoned among the spurious; 'but are to be rejected, as altogether absurd and impious:' that is, in other words, according to what he says in another passage cited above, they are altogether spurious, and were universally rejected by catholic Christians.

Thus we have settled all these several sorts of books; four of which are, I think, plainly (c) discernible in our second passage. Whether there is any ground for a fifth division, which I have mentioned, namely, the second in order, will be considered by the attentive reader.

* Οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς καθολικοῖς ἀλλ' ὡς ἄποστατοι καὶ δυσσεβεῖς παρὰ τὴν πίστιν. p. 98. A. (c) I beg leave to observe, that Mr. Turner understood our author to speak of four sorts of books. He is the only person, whom I have met with, who thought of more than three. And we are independent witnesses to this point. For this article in the chapter of Eusebius

(which has long lain by me) was composed before I had any knowledge of Mr. Turner's work, in which he considers this matter. His words are: 'Eusebius's account 'of the sacred books, in that chapter, is 'somewhat confused. But he seems to 'rank them in four classes.' R. Turner's Discourse upon the pretended Apostolical Constitutions, p. 168—171.

5. The next remark I would make is a kind of corollary from the foregoing passages and observations; that the words contradicted, controverted, and spurious, are not to be understood only of the genuineness of a work; or of a doubt and controversy, whether it was really written by the person to whom it is ascribed, and whose name it bears; but whether it has a right to be a part of the New Testament. It might be unquestionably genuine, or generally allowed to be so; and yet be contradicted, that is, rejected by some, a good number; or be spurious, generally rejected from being a part of the New Testament. This is extremely evident with regard to the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, which in a passage cited just now, we saw placed among contradicted scriptures, though it was owned^b by every body for a genuine work of Clement bishop of Rome, and companion of the blessed apostle Paul. The controversy therefore about that epistle was only, whether it should be reckoned a book of the New Testament. And though it be called by Eusebius only a contradicted book, there seem to have been very few on the affirmative side of the question, for admitting it into the New Testament. Inasmuch that in this respect, it might be placed among the spurious, that is, those which were generally rejected. This observation ought to be applied to the epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas: for whose sake it is, indeed, principally intended: but I think, I need not stay any longer to shew the justness of it with regard to them. Those writings are the genuine works of the authors whose names they bear; but with regard to any claim to be parts of the sacred scriptures of the New Testament, properly so called, they are contradicted, or rather spurious, generally rejected.

6. The character of the authors or writers of the several books of sacred scripture is observable: they are all apostles, or apostolical men. Nor are there any writings of barely apostolical men authentic, and universally acknowledged, excepting those of Mark and Luke, which are only historical, not doctrinal or dogmatical. All the other books, which are epistolary, or dogmatical, as the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Epistle of Clement, and the Shepherd of Hermas, as likewise the Epistle of James, and Jude, and the Revelation of John, (which some were not fully satisfied to have been written by apostles, but by an elder only, or other person of inferior rank

^b — τῇ Κλημεντοῦ ὁμολογούμενῃ μιᾷ ἐπιστολῇ. H. E. I. iii. c. 16. — αὐτομολογούμενῃ παρὰ πάντων. ib. c. 38. p. 110.

A. — τῇ Κλημεντοῦ ὁμολογούμενῃ γράφῃ. ibid. C.

to that of apostles), were controverted; contradicted, either by some, or by many, so as to deserve the appellation of spurious. This seems to shew, that it was a common and prevailing opinion among Christians in those times, that no book, doctrinal or preceptive, ought to be received as of authority, unless written by an apostle; and that the credit of men not apostles, though they were companions of apostles, was admitted no farther than as historians, or reporters of what they had seen, or of what they had heard from apostles, or eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word.

We actually see the traces of this prevailing opinion in the judgment formed of divers writings and persons. The epistle of Clement, a companion of the apostle Paul, expressly celebrated by him, which epistle too, was universally allowed to be genuine, is a contradicted book, and received by a very few, as a part of the New Testament. Nor does it appear, that any of the epistles of Ignatius or Polycarp, though they likewise were disciples of apostles, ever obtained so much credit, as to be admitted by any into the canon of scripture.

Here this sentiment appears very clearly: every body knew who were authors of those epistles; and for that very reason, few or none ever thought of placing them among sacred scriptures. If the authors of those epistles had been unknown, some might have thought them to have been written by apostles; and those epistles might have made a considerable claim to be parts of the New Testament: but now they stand clearly in the rank only of excellent ecclesiastical writings.

An apostolical man, then, was not supposed to have a right or power to deliver admonitions, exhortations, counsels, precepts, or to write of doctrines, in an authoritative manner. They may make reports, or write histories of the preaching and miracles of Christ or his apostles, which shall be received as of authority; provided they are known to be apostolical men, intimate companions, and approved fellow-labourers of apostles, as Mark and Luke were. But that is the utmost credit and authority of men of this rank, high as it was.

7. We have a fine observation of our author, concerning the employment of the apostles, and their backwardness to write, and the occasions of the few books or epistles which were written by them at last.

And it may be well supposed, that Eusebius here speaks agreeably to the information he had received from more ancient Christian writers.

¹ Exactly to this purpose, Iren. l. iii. c. 1. — per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quicumque præconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in scripturis nobis tradiderunt. &c.

And I think, that according to his account, all the books of the New Testament, now commonly received among us, are occasional writings, except the book of the Revelation; the author of which, chap. i. 11. is expressly directed to *write in a book, and send it to the seven churches that are in Asia*. And he says of the apostles in general, that they were not greatly concerned about writing. And of those two apostles that wrote gospels, he says particularly, that 'they were compelled to write by a kind of necessity.' For by tradition of more ancient writers he had been informed, that Matthew wrote his gospel for the benefit of the Christians in Judea; that when he left them, it might supply the want of his presence. And there were traditions of several reasons of John's writing his gospel: one was, that having seen the three gospels first written, he observed, that there was still wanting a written relation of the beginning of Christ's ministry: moreover, two of the former evangelists had written the genealogy of Christ according to the flesh; but the account of Christ's divinity had been reserved for him. The occasion of Mark's writing his gospel has been also mentioned in this author's Ecclesiastical History. And he says, that Luke himself has at the beginning of his gospel assigned the reason why he wrote; which was to put into our hands a full and certain account of Christ's ministry, in the room of those uncertain and defective relations which had been written by others, and were already got abroad in the world.

This may be supposed to be, for the main part, and in the general, a true account of the occasion of writing the several gospels. Nor let any therefore be in pain, and suspect, that then there would have been danger, lest we should have had no gospels, or authentic written records concerning Christ and his doctrine: for if the apostles performed the most difficult part of their ministry, and fulfilled the command of Christ, *to go and preach to all nations*, and did discharge that work with zeal and resolution, accompanied with those miracles, which the divine power they had received from Christ enabled them to perform, there certainly would be occasion for writing both gospels and epistles. The converts which the apostles made; would many of them be desirous of written memoirs of the great and excellent things, which they had heard; and would certainly intreat apostles themselves, or their ministers and companions, to deliver to them such accounts, to help their memory.

And

And upon the apostles relating frequently in their sermons, in many parts of the world, and to great numbers of people, the discourses and miracles of Jesus, and performing many other like miracles themselves, it was very likely, that some should be so moved and affected by those extraordinary things, as to compose and publish relations of them, though they were not fully qualified for the work. These imperfect, and not sufficiently attested relations, would very naturally provoke and excite some one or more, well acquainted with those things, to write a history of them, which might be depended upon as certain. And having seen some histories of the acts of Christ, which, though written with a good intention, and from a good principle, were not fitted for general use, nor suited to the importance of the design; it was very natural for the same person, for the same reason, and with the same view, to undertake a second work, containing a history of the acts of Christ's apostles, and of the planting and spreading the Christian doctrine in several places, after the resurrection of Jesus, and his ascension to heaven: in order the better to prevent the setting out any such defective, not well attested relations of these things, as he had actually seen of the life of Christ. It was highly probable, that the design of this second work should enter into the mind of the same person who had undertaken the former, for the reason just mentioned: especially considering, that he was more peculiarly qualified for this latter performance, as he had been himself an eye-witness of a large part of these things, which were to be the materials of it; and he had the honour and happiness of being intimately acquainted with some of the principal persons, whose words and works, journeyings, dangers and sufferings, he was now to relate.

It was also very likely, that if some one apostle was by divine Providence preserved to a great age, he should come to the sight of the memoirs of Christ's life first written. And as the former evangelists had been much intent upon brevity in their narrations, and confined themselves, chiefly, to the more public parts of Christ's ministry; it was very natural for him to judge it proper to give the world a written relation of some things omitted by them. There might be also such a change in the circumstances of things, since the time of writing the more early gospels, as might contribute to determine his resolution of adding a new and fourth gospel to those already written.

Moreover, if the apostles of Jesus Christ, and his other disciples, and their immediate converts, preached the gospel with

that zeal and diligence which might be reasonably expected, and formed and constituted in several parts distinct societies, or churches, of the converts they made by preaching and conference; it could not be, considering the weakness of human nature, and the condition and character of the persons of which those churches were constituted (many of whom had been lately involved in vice, and the grossest darkness and ignorance), but that some of those churches would need farther instructions, for their confirmation and establishment, or for correcting disorders they fell into, or for securing them from the seduction of selfish and artful leaders and teachers crept in among them, or endeavouring to do so. Such wants and necessities of those religious societies would excite the care and attention of the apostles by whom they had been formed. And as the apostles could not visit in person so often as they would, much less be always present with, all the churches they had planted; their tender concern and affection for their welfare, and their zeal for the principles of which they were fully persuaded, and which they had preached and instilled into the minds of men with great labour and many hazards, would oblige and induce them to write epistles to them, containing sufficient instructions about every thing relating to their case, and which the support and flourishing interest of the Christian religion required. And some apostles, in the great and uncommon zeal with which they were animated, in all probability would be induced to write epistles also to some churches or Christians formed and converted by others, and whom they had not seen; that nothing might be wanting to them, for completing their faith in the gospel, and securing their steadfastness therein, and a conversation and behaviour of life becoming it.

Finally, it was likewise probable, that some occasions should offer, which in a manner required, the writing of some epistles to particular persons, for recommending some good office of kindness to a Christian brother, and for giving directions about the officers settled, or to be appointed and settled in Christian societies, for promoting good order, and the interest of religion among them.

Eusebius says, then, that ‘the apostles employing the demonstration of the divine Spirit working with them, spread the gospel over the world. Nor were they’ [at the first] ‘much concerned to write, being engaged in a more excellent ministry, exceeding all human power:’ that is, in preaching and spreading the gospel every where. This likewise I take to be a just, and true, and fine observation. That ministry

was indeed 'above human power,' not only with regard to the miracles performed by them; but their preaching the doctrine of the gospel to all the world, as they did, was also a divine work. To discourse, dispute, and argue with men of all characters, and thus to recommend the truths of religion, requires more and greater talents of the mind, as well as more virtue, especially in the apostles' circumstances, than to write for them. For in preaching the heavenly doctrine of the gospel, contrary to rooted and general errors and prejudices and darling passions, before men of all ranks and characters, princes and people, philosophers and mechanics, Jews and Gentiles, which required a different sort of treatment; there was necessary not only a clear and distinct knowledge of the doctrine itself, and the several arguments by which it might be most fitly demonstrated and recommended, but also great zeal, and courage, and presence of mind, suited to sudden occasions and emergencies; as well as a fixed resolution to suffer all manner of evil, rather than deny it, rather than not openly profess and teach it. This is very different from composing an argument in private, and at our leisure. We write in the study free from noise and danger: we take the time, when we find ourselves best disposed for the work. If we oppose an absurd opinion, and a perverse and unreasonable adversary; though he be far out of sight, or a man we never saw, we find a difficulty in governing our temper, and restraining all harshness and indecency of expression. And when we have finished the work, if the truth we defend be unpopular and unacceptable; we send forth our performance with abundance of caution, perhaps without a name, and in the most reserved and secret manner we can devise. But the apostles in preaching the gospel, were under a necessity of engaging at all seasons, with all sorts of characters and tempers: and were obliged to meekness under provocations, and courage in the midst of all sorts of dangers and threatenings. For such a service many great talents are needful, either acquired or infused. And since the apostles, generally speaking, had not the former in a great degree, they must have been favoured with the latter.

The work therefore of preaching the gospel, in which the apostles were engaged, was, as Eusebius says, 'a most excellent ministry, and above human power:' it was likewise the fittest to be first performed. To have written memoirs of Christ's life, or treatises of the truth of the Christian religion, before those things had been preached, and before some considerable number of converts had been made, would have signified very

little. In that way, the gospel would not, in the course of many ages, if ever, have been spread over the world, as it was by the preaching of the apostles in a few years.

Our Saviour's command to his first apostles was: *Go^a ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them, — teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.* Paul in like manner was chosen and appointed of Christ, to¹ *bear his name before the gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel.* And he^m *was made a minister and witness of the things which he had seen, and of those things in which Christ should appear unto him: and he shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.* These were Christ's own directions, and it was fit they should be first performed: and it was indeed a glorious work, by public preaching to convert men from their errors and vices, to the faith of God and Jesus Christ; and engage them to make a profession of faith in Jesus by baptism, and then to continue the profession and avowal of that faith, by worshipping God according to the rule of the gospel in religious societies of their own.

If therefore the apostles of Christ performed the work appointed them by him, (as they did with amazing success, but not with greater success than might be reasonably expected, considering all the helps, and all the arguments, he had furnished them with, both for animating them, and convincing others:) there certainly would be occasions and demands for writing such books, as the New Testament now consists of; gospels, Acts, and epistles.

And though these writings were of the utmost importance, and of absolute necessity, for preserving the Christian religion in purity in following ages: and though these writings are now of much more immediate advantage to us, than the preaching of Christ and his apostles: yet it was best not only for men of that, but likewise of all future ages, and of us in particular, in these late ages, that the doctrine of the gospel should be first preached by Christ and his apostles, and that a large number of converts should be made, before those books were written, which were to be the rule of faith and manners to Christians in all future times. By this means we now have in these books, demonstrations of the truth of the Christian religion impossible to have been afforded in any other way. Beside the most glorious example of Jesus Christ, in the course of

^a Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

¹ Acts ix. 15.

^m — xxvi. 16, 20.

his personal ministry, we see such zeal, such resolution, fortitude, self-denial, disinterestedness, patience, meekness, and such extraordinary gifts in his apostles, as afford a rational and most convincing evidence of the truth of the doctrine preached by them, and which we have received from them. The several occasions of writing the historical books, such as the request of believers, and the publication of imperfect memoirs of Christ, are proofs that the gospel had been preached to the world, and had been received by many, notwithstanding the discouraging circumstances, which both the preaching and receiving it must have been attended with. The epistles of the apostles written to Christian societies, or to particular Christians, are also undeniable evidences of the success of the apostles' ministry; of the divine works, by which that ministry was supported; of the extraordinary gifts conferred by them, and received by their converts; of the sincerity, courage, patience of the first disciples and converts of the apostles in general; and of the eminent and stedfast virtue of many of them. Indeed, they are such evidences of these things, as could never have appeared in any treatises, or set arguments whatever, composed to persuade men to embrace the religion of Jesus. In a word, the gospel has been most effectually spread, the most complete and most lasting evidence of the truth of the Christian religion has been afforded, and the best arguments to an open and stedfast profession of the truth and to a virtuous conversation suitable to it, have been given by the apostles first preaching the gospel to all sorts of persons, in almost every part of the world, and then composing and delivering such writings, whether historical or epistolary, as were suited to the wants and desires, and fitted for the establishment and improvement of the converts they had made.

Finally, we have in this way greater security for the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, and the integrity of the copies of them, than otherwise we should have had. They were published at the earnest intreaties of some, or written and addressed to others, who would certainly set a great value on them. There were many persons in being, who would receive them with the greatest esteem whenever they came to their knowledge. And as there were many who must needs shew a great regard for them, and be desirous to have them in their hands, and make use of them, as helps to their memories in things they had heard with attention; we have the greater reason to conclude, that these books were soon transcribed, and many copies taken of them: which would be a great se-

curity against corrupting and interpolating them; if any, to carry on particular interests, had formed such a design.

8. In these passages are also some good observations for harmonizing the gospels, and for determining the duration of our Saviour's personal ministry. The reader doubtless remembers what our author writes of St. John's saying: 'that the three former evangelists had written the truth, but there was still wanting a history of the things done by Christ in the first part and beginning of his ministry.' I need not therefore enlarge here upon this matter. It may be, however, farther observed, that^a in another place of the same Ecclesiastical History, Eusebius says, our Lord's ministry was above three years, and not quite four years complete. But his argument there alleged for that opinion, from the number of Jewish high-priests during the period of Christ's preaching, is absurd and groundless, as appears from Josephus: though Eusebius endeavours to support his opinion from that Jewish author. In the Demonstration, he speaks of our Saviour's ministry being three years and an half.

9. We may likewise observe, that the account which Eusebius gives of the opinion of men in his time, is agreeable to what we have seen in the passages of authors before his time. In the writings of ancient authors, whom we have consulted, we have found more numerous quotations of the books universally received in Eusebius's time, than of the others, whose authority was disputed and controverted.

Indeed, some may be hence ready to argue, that we might at first have sat down contented with these passages of the bishop of Cæsarea, representing the sense of Christians in his time, founded upon the testimony of antiquity, without looking any farther. But, certainly, it is a satisfaction to see ourselves the testimonies of the ancients to the scriptures of the New Testament. If we had not consulted those authors, we could not have been so fully persuaded of the justness of Eusebius's account, as now we are. Nor did he expect that men should rely upon his account: he does not deliver his judgment magisterially: but having in these passages represented, partly his own opinion, partly the general sentiments of other men about the books of scripture, or some of them, he adds: 'but this point shall be decided hereafter by the authority of the ancients.' Nor would this great man, if he were witness to

Vid. H. E. l. i. c. 10. & Valsc. notas.

* *Ἰστορεῖται δὲ ὁ πᾶς τῆς διδασκαλίας καὶ παραδεξομένης ἡμῶν τῇ αὐτῆς χειρὶ τριῶν* *πῶσον γέγονας ἔτην.* — Dem. l. viii. p. 400. B.

our proceedings condemn our design, nor take it amiss, that after a long interval we thought it proper to imitate himself, and resumed the design of inquiring after and examining the testimonies of more ancient writers, collected and exhibited by him in the immortal work of his Ecclesiastical History, or any others, that are to be found elsewhere in the original authors that remain.

I hope that we have now in a good measure discovered the true sense and meaning of these passages of Eusebius; though it must be allowed, they are somewhat obscure and confused: and we could have wished, that he had employed a little more time in penning them, and had expressed himself with more perspicuity and exactness. However, in matters of this vast importance honesty is the main thing; and I think, we have no cause to complain of any defect of that kind in these passages of our author. If he writes without art, he writes also without reserve. He acknowledges that there were different opinions upon this head. And whilst he assures us there were some books received by all the churches under heaven, he owns there were others, about which there were disputes: and likewise, that there had been forged and published gospels and Acts under the name of divers apostles. Eusebius also deserves commendation for the calmness with which he writes of these matters. He represents different opinions without hard names, or fierceness of temper. This is not only excellent in itself, and therefore agreeable; but it is still farther agreeable, in that it confirms the truth and fairness of the account. It is true, he absolutely rejects this last sort of books, and with some indignation, as impious: but it was his duty to tell us what they were, and what catholic Christians thought of them. They were books containing things mean and absurd, and were destitute of all ancient testimonies to the high original they pretended to, and consequently were manifest forgeries: and certainly it is impious to forge writings under the names of any men, much more of apostles. And we have a great deal of reason to be pleased, to find that the ancient Christians were ever cautious what writings they received, as the works of apostles, or apostolical men: and that having exercised a judicious critique, they stomached such compositions as these, and rejected them with abhorrence.

IX. As we have largely observed the representation given by Eusebius, of the general sense and opinion of Christians in his time, concerning the scriptures of the New Testament;

we ought now to consider, what was his own sentiment concerning the books of that collection.

1. And doubtless we ought to suppose, and take for granted, that he owned for sacred and divine scripture all those books, which he assures us were then universally received as such.

2. I need not therefore make many remarks here relating to the four gospels, his testimony to them in many passages that have passed before us being clear and express: however, it may not be amiss to recollect and put down here a few particulars.

3. The evangelist Matthew he supposed to be one of Christ's twelve apostles, who had been before a publican.

4. The evangelist Mark he supposed to be a companion and disciple of Peter. It does not appear, that our great author thought the writer of the gospel to be John, surnamed Mark, often mentioned in the Acts of the apostles, and likewise by St. Paul in Coloss. iv. 10. and 2 Tim. iv. 11. But unquestionably he supposed him to be the same that is mentioned 1 Pet. v. 13.

5. As for St. Luke's character, we have seen in a passage above cited, that he supposed him to have been originally a physician of Antioch: and doubtless the same also who is mentioned by St. Paul, Coloss. iv. 14. Consequently, it is probable that he thought this evangelist to have been a gentile Christian: whether rightly, or not, we do not now enquire.

6. The fourth evangelist, John, as we have seen, he thought to be one of Christ's twelve apostles, son of Zebedee, and brother of James: and how he speaks of him and his gospel, and the occasion of it, has been seen by us in several places. When he quotes him, he not seldom calls him the ^p great and admirable evangelist John. He ^q calls him a Hebrew divine. That he gives him that title, in regard to the beginning of his gospel, appears, I think, from several ^r places: and I put in the margin ^s two other passages, where this evangelist is spoken of by Eusebius in the same character. Eusebius is the first ancient author who has given him this title: and it may be observed, that he characterises Moses in the like manner, calling him also ^t the great Hebrew divine.

^p Vid. not. r. ^q — τον εβραιον
 θεολογον. Pr. Evang. l. xi. c. 18. p. 340. B.
^r — Λογον, ον θεολογον ο μισας ανα-
 γιδης Ιωαννης. Deut. Ev. l. iv. p. 179.
 C. — ωστις ο θαυμασιος αναγιδης Ιωαν-
 νης μεζον η καλα τωθωπον μεγαλοφωνα
 τον σωτηρα και κυριον ημων θεολογον. κ. λ.

Dem. l. vii. c. 1. p. 309. C.

^s — τον θεολογον και αναγιδην. De
 Ec. Th. l. i. p. 92. D. ο μισας αναγι-
 δης, αμα και θεολογος. Ib. l. ii. c. 12.
 p. 119. C. ^t — μισας θεολογος
 Μωσης, Εβραιος ων εξ Εβραιων. Pater.
 Ev. l. vii. c. 7. p. 305. A.

7. Before I proceed, I would add, that we have also seen, that this very learned ancient Christian Bishop received the genealogy in St. Matthew, and that he makes no question about the genuineness of that, or any part of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's gospel, or of the first chapter of St. Luke's gospel, which chapters are often quoted in his works.

8. The book of the Acts is another of those books, which he assures us were universally received. It is expressly mentioned by Eusebius as such in these passages, and ascribed to Luke as the author, and called divinely inspired scripture. He elsewhere likewise often quotes this book, as "divine scripture, and the ^{*} sacred scripture of the Acts: he often quotes it by the title of the Acts, Acts of the Apostles, and written by St. Luke; of which [†] I put some examples in the margin.

9. By the epistles of the apostle Paul, spoken of in the long passages above cited, there can be no question but he means those we have, which are often expressly mentioned and quoted in the works of this writer, by the titles used among us, of the churches, or particular persons, to whom they were sent. Thirteen epistles therefore, which were received by all as the apostle Paul's, were likewise undoubtedly received as such by Eusebius.

10. Whether he received the epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's, which in passages cited by us he has several times spoken of as one of the controverted books of scripture, will require some consideration.

11. And here it may not be amiss to recollect several expressions in those passages, concerning the general reception of this epistle. I have put them together under the second remark, in the second ^{*} division of the books of the New Testament.

12. We ought also to recollect what Eusebius said, speaking of the famous and universally acknowledged epistle of Clement of Rome, the companion of the apostle Paul: 'In ^{*} which,' says he, 'inserting many sentiments of the epistle to the Hebrews, and also using some of the very words of it, he [†] plainly manifests that epistle to be no modern writing. And

^{*} — ως φησιν η θεια φραση. H. E. l. ii. c. 9. p. 47. A. [†] Διδασκαλος και τωτων η ιερα των πραξεων γραφη. l. ii. c. 18. p. 59. D. [‡] Ο Αγκας εν ταις πραξεσι. H. E. l. i. c. 5. p. 17. D. ε Αγκας εν ταις πραξεσι των αποστολων. l. iii. c. 31. p. 103. A. Vid. l. ii. c. 11. in. & c. 21. & passim. οιδη πρωτοις τε Ιησν Μα-

θηται εν τη βιβλω των ιδιων πραξεων. Dem. Ev. l. iii. p. 128. B. ^{*} See p. 233.

[†] See before, Vol. ii. p. 26, 27.

[‡] — σαφιστατα παριστησι οτι μη νουν υπαρχει το συγγραμμα. Οθεν εκολως ιδοξεν, αυτω τοις λοιποις ισαλαλεχθηναι γραμμασι τε αποστολων. H. E. l. iii. c. 38. p. 110. A.

' hence

‘hence it has not without reason been reckoned among the other writings of the apostle: for Paul having written to the Hebrews in their own language, some think that the evangelist Luke, others, that this very Clement translated it [into Greek]; which last is the more probable of the two, there being a resemblance between the style of the epistle of Clement, and that to the Hebrews; nor are the sentiments of those two writings very different.’

13. Eusebius does also not seldom quote this epistle as Paul’s. Thus, in the account of a Christian martyr, who told his judge, that Jerusalem was his country: ‘meaning,’ says the historian, ‘that Jerusalem of which Paul speaks: *but Jerusalem which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all.* And, ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.’ In the Ecclesiastical History he speaks of ‘the epistle to the Hebrews, and divers other epistles of Paul.’ He quotes this epistle as ‘sacred scripture’ in the Evangelical Preparation: as the apostle’s in the Demonstration. And in a like manner often in his books against Marcellus, and in his Commentaries upon the Psalms, and Isaiah: from the former of which I shall by and by quote a remarkable passage.

14. Theodoret, without hesitation, positively says, that Eusebius received the epistle to the Hebrews, as a writing of the divine Paul; and that he said, all the ancients were of the same opinion, Which must be reckoned but a loose quotation, if thereby he intends (as I apprehend he does), Eusebius’s citation of Origen in his Ecclesiastical history.

15. Once more, Eusebius is reckoned by Stephen Gobar, in Photius, among those many ancient writers, who count

^c De Martyr. Pal. c. xi. p. 337.

^d Gal. iv. 26. ^e Hebr. xii. 22.

^f — οποιας η τε προς εβραιους, και αλλαι πληρεις τη Παυλη περιεχουσιν επιστολαι. H. E. l. ii. c. 17. p. 55. D.

^g — τη τε υπερ λειψ σαφιερον ειποντος. — Pr. Ev. l. xii. c. 19. p. 592. D.

^h Ταυτα μιν ο αποστολος. Dem. Ev. l. v. c. 3. p. 223. D. 224. A. B.

ⁱ Και αρχιερα δε αυτον ο αυτος αποστολος αποκαλει λεγων. De Ecc. Th. l. i. p. 95. B. & passim.

^k — περι ης διαμαρτης σκηνης και ο θεος αποστολος διδασκων ειπεν τοιςτοις εχομεν αρχιερα. — [Heb. viii.] Comm. in Pf. p. 175. E. ο αυτος αποστολος εν τη προς εβραιους φησιν. ib.

p. 355. & passim.

^l Παριστοι δε τε ορος ο αποστολος ειπων. Comm. in H. p. 454. C. & passim.

^m Ευσεβιος ην ειχην πεισθηναι το παλαισι — και ειλος γαρ τη διειδατε Παυλη τη δε τη ιστιν λην ημολοησεν εικαι και της παλαιας απαντας ταυτην περι αυτης εφηνεν ισχυρησαι τυ δοξαι. Thdr. Argum. in Ep. ad Hebr.

ⁿ Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. vi. c. 25. p. 227. D. And the passage is cited in this work, Vol. ii. p. 467.

^o Οι — κληροι μιλτοι και Ευσεβιος, και πολλος αλλος του θεοφορων παλιν ομιλος, ταις αλλακεισιν ριθμοσι ταυτην επιστολαι, και φασιν αυτη εκ της εβραιδος μεταφρασσαι τοις ιεραις κλημεναι. Phot. Cod. 232. p. 904. m.

this epistle among the other epistles of Paul, and say, that it was translated out of Hebrew by Clement of Rome.

16. All these particulars are sufficient to afford full satisfaction, that in the churches with which Eusebius was best acquainted, this epistle was generally received as the apostle Paul's, and that he was himself also much inclined to admit it as such. Nevertheless, perhaps it may be questioned, whether he was fully persuaded of it. If he had, he would scarce have expressed himself as he does in the place before cited, relating to the parallel passages of this and Clement's epistle; 'that he thereby clearly shews it to be no modern composition.' As the evidence of this epistle being Paul's did not appear equally clear with that for his other epistles, the persuasion was not equally certain, and doubts, as it seems, were sometimes apt to arise in his mind about it.

17. In order to judge of this writer's sentiments concerning the epistle of James, which, as he before informed us, was the first of the seven epistles called catholic, but was disputed by many, we must observe several passages. But I choose not to insist on any general^p citations, without the name of book, or author of those words, *God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble*; because, though they are found in James iv. 6. they are also in Prov. iii. 34. and 1 Pet. v. 5. And besides, there are divers passages of Eusebius, where this epistle is plainly quoted.

18. In his books of Ecclesiastical Theology he observes, 'As^q it is said in another place, *Confess^r your sins one to another.*' In the Commentary upon the Psalms, 'Since^r the scripture^t says, *Love not detraction, lest thou be destroyed.* And *speak^w not evil, brethren, one of another, lest ye fall into condemnation.*' Again, in the same Commentary upon the Psalms, 'The^x sacred Apostle therefore says, *Is^z any among you afflicted? let him pray: Is any merry? let him sing psalms.*'

19. These are quotations of the epistle: we must also observe some other passages, beside that before transcribed concerning James, called the Just, and the brother of our Lord, whom Eusebius supposes to be the author of this epistle.

^p Vid. Euseb. Comm. in Pf. p. 446. D. in If. p. 450. A.

^q — καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐξομολογῆσαι ἀλλήλοις τὰς ἁμαρτίας. De Ec. Th. l. iii. p. 152. A.

^r James v. 16. ^s Τῆς γραφῆς λέγει: Μὴ ἀσπα καὶ λαλαῶν, ἵνα μὴ ἐξαρτῇς· καὶ μὴ καὶ λαλαῶν ἀλλήλων, ἀδελφοί, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεκρίσιν ᾤσῃ. In Pf. p. 648.

B.

^t Prov. xx. 13. Our translation, more agreeably to the Hebrew and Symmachus: *Love not sleep, lest thou come to poverty.*

^w See James iv. 11. & v. 12. ^x Λέγει γὰρ ὁ ἁγίος ἀποστόλος. Κακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν; προσευχάσθω· ἐν θυμῷ τις; Ψαλλάτω. in Pf. p. 247. C.

^z James v. 13.

20. In the Ecclesiastical History, having mentioned some traditions relating to Christ's seventy disciples, he proceeds, 'And * any attentive person may perceive, that Christ had * more than seventy disciples. This is evident from the testimony of Paul, without searching for other proof: who says, 'that after his resurrection from the dead * he was *seen of Cephas, then of the twelve, and after them of above five hundred brethren at once. Of whom some, he says, were fallen asleep; but the greater part remained at the time he wrote. After that, says he, he was seen of James.* So * that he also was one of those called disciples of the Lord, as well as one of his brethren. Lastly, there being many other beside the twelve, who in resemblance of them were called apostles, as was also Paul himself, he adds, *Then he was seen of all the apostles.*'

We need not stay to consider, whether Eusebius rightly understands this text of St. Paul; it is plain, he did not think this James one of Christ's disciples, but a disciple in general, possibly one of the seventy, and also one of those called the brethren of the Lord, and an apostle in the larger and looser sense of the word.

21. In another chapter of the Ecclesiastical History, he says, that * 'this James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, brother of the Lord, son of Joseph, husband of Mary, was surnamed the Just by the ancients, on account of the eminence of his virtue.'

22. In his Evangelical Demonstration, speaking again of this James, he calls him 'the brother of our Lord: * and says, that 'the * people of Jerusalem called him the Just, on account of his transcendent virtue.'

23. But the most remarkable passage of Eusebius relating to this matter, is in his Commentary upon the seventeenth chapter of Isaiah, where he computes fourteen apostles of our Saviour; that is, beside the twelve including Matthias, two other, in all fourteen. 'Of * which,' says he, 'the twelve * may be reckoned the first [or chief] apostles; and after them

^a Vid. H. E. l. i. c. 12. p. 31. A. B.

^b 1 Cor. xv. 5—7. ^c Εἰς δὲ καὶ εἰς τῶν φερομένων τε σώτηρος Μαθητῶν ἀλλὰ μὴ καὶ ἀδελφῶν ἦν. Εἰδὲ ὡς παρὰ τῆς κατὰ μνήμην τῶν δώδεκα πλείων ὅσων ὑπερξάνων ἀποστόλων, οἷος καὶ αὐτοῦ οὗ Παύλου ἦν, προσέθηκεν λέγων· Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὡφθη τοῖς ἀπὸστολοις πάσι. Ib. B. ^d Τέτε δὲ ἴσα καὶ Ἰακώβου τοῦ τῇ κυρίῳ λεγομένου ἀδελφοῦ, οἷοι δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰωσήφ υἱομαχοῦ πάσις — τέλει δὲ ἐν αἰτίῳ Ἰακώβου, ὅν καὶ δικαίον

ἐπικλήθη οἱ πάλαι δ' ἀρίστῃ ἐκάλουν ἐπὶ ῥημάτι. H. E. l. ii. c. 1. p. 38. B. C.

^e — οὐ οἱ πάλαι τὰ Ἱερουσόλυμα εἰκόντες ἐκάλουν δικαίον διὰ τὰ τῆς ἀρίστης ἐπιτελέματα. Dem. Ev. l. iii. c. 5. p. 116. C.

^f — διὰ καὶ τίσσας ποιήσας τῆς παλαιᾶς, ὡν δώδεκα μὲν τῆς πρώτης ἀποστόλης εἰποῖς ἀνελαι, ἐκ ἑλάντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῆς ἀρίστης Παύλου, καὶ αὐτῶν οἷα κλητοῖ ἀποστόλων, καὶ τοῦ Ἰακώβου γινώσκοντες τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τῇ κυρίῳ. κ. λ. in l. c. 17. p. 422. C. D.

* Paul,

‘ Paul, who was not inferior to them in virtue [or power],
 ‘ who was also called to be an apostle; and James, the brother
 ‘ of our Lord, who is said to have been appointed by our Sa-
 ‘ viour himself the first bishop * of Jerusalem.’

Hence it appears, that Eusebius thought there were three apostles, named James; the son of Zebedee, brother of John, the son of Alpheus, and the brother of our Lord: which last James, therefore, is not in his account the son of Alpheus, but a different person, not one of the first twelve apostles, but a fourteenth with Paul.

24. Upon what we have seen in Eusebius relating to this epistle, and the author of it, we may now make the following remarks.

1.) He had a considerable respect for this epistle. This may be inferred from his quotations of it, though they are not numerous, and from his calling the author apostle, and particularly from his reckoning him one of Christ's fourteen apostles.

2.) Nevertheless, Eusebius does not make him equal to the twelve and Paul. This is evident from the last cited passage: he says, the twelve may be not unfitly styled Christ's chief apostles: and he adds, that Paul was not inferior to them; but he does not say so of James, whom he reckons the fourteenth.

3.) It is very probable, there were others about that time who had the same notion with Eusebius, about the author of this epistle. If there were, it is no wonder, that the right of this epistle to be a part of the New Testament was disputed. For since the writer was not, or was not supposed to be, one of Christ's twelve apostles, nor equal to them, (as no other beside Paul was), they would not allow this epistle to be one of the sacred books of the New Testament. This may then be very probably reckoned one reason, why this was a contradicted book.

4.) Possibly, we may now be able to judge of the meaning of those expressions concerning this epistle before quoted: ‘ It ought to be observed, that it is spurious.’ It is likely, the meaning is, that it was generally rejected. I own indeed, that it cannot be proved, that Eusebius himself did esteem this epistle of equal authority with epistles written by any of the twelve apostles and Paul. Nevertheless, since the words spurious, and altogether spurious, are used by him in other places,

* St. Jerom, in his Commentary upon the same chapter in Isaiah, does in a manner transcribe this passage of Eusebius: but instead of James he puts Barnabas: duas olivas Paulum & Barnabam. Tom. iii. p. 176. m. With which may be compared what he writes in his book against Helvidius. T. iv. p. 137, 138.

where he sorts and divides books according to the opinions of men about them; I think the phrase ought to be taken in this sense in that passage also.

25. The first epistle of Peter undoubtedly was received by Eusebius. He has assured us, it was one of the unquestioned books of the New Testament, and acknowledged by all. We have likewise seen, that he supposed it to be written to Jewish Christians in the countries mentioned at the beginning.

26. As for the second of Peter, in the second passage he placeth it among the controverted books. In the third he says, 'we are informed by the tradition of the ancients, that it is not a part of the [New] Testament.' And afterwards, in the same passage he says again, that 'he knows but of one epistle of Peter that is genuine, and acknowledged by the presbyters of former times.' These are strong expressions; and though in these chapters he represents very much the opinions of men about these books, yet he seems here to declare also his own opinion, so far as to say, that he does not esteem it certainly for an epistle of the apostle Peter. And that he did not receive as such, may be argued from the little or no notice taken of it any where else in his works, except when he is giving an account of the opinions of ancient writers, or of those of his own time. For I do not remember, that he has quoted it himself in his Ecclesiastical History, or his Preparation, or Demonstration, or in his books against Marcellus, or in his Commentaries upon the Psalms and Isaiah; in a word, in any work of his, undoubtedly genuine.

26. The first epistle of John is another unquestioned book, universally allowed to be written by the apostle of that name; and therefore also received by our author.

27. Of the second and third epistles he speaks doubtfully in the second passage, placing them among the controverted books: 'Where,' says he, 'they are written by the evangelist, or another of the same name.' And that these two epistles were not received by Eusebius, appears to me very probable, so far as I do not remember either of them to be quoted by him in any of the works above-mentioned.

28. There is however a passage of the Evangelical Demonstration, which may not be overlooked. It is a passage which was largely cited ^h above, upon another account. Having alledged some proofs of the integrity and modesty of Matthew in his gospel, he adds, 'You may observe John to be of the

^h p. 222, 223.

‘ same mind with Matthew : for¹ in his epistles, he either
 ‘ names not himself at all, or calls himself only elder, no
 ‘ where apostle or evangelist. In his gospel, when he speaks
 ‘ of him whom Jesus loved, he does not mention himself by
 ‘ name.’ Here Eusebius evidently refers to the three epistles,
 well known, and ascribed by many to the apostle John ; to the
 first, undoubtedly his, in which he names not himself at all ;
 and to the other two, at the beginning of both which he calls
 himself elder : and Eusebius speaks of all three as written by
 John the evangelist. But this affords no certain proof, that he
 was persuaded they were all written by one and the same per-
 son. It is sufficient foundation for the observation there pro-
 posed, that they were generally, or by many supposed to be
 written by the apostle. As for himself, he has plainly shewn
 by what he says elsewhere, and by not quoting the two last
 epistles, that he was not fully satisfied they were written by the
 apostle and evangelist.

29. The epistle of Jude we have several times seen placed
 among controverted books; nor do I recollect any quotation
 of this epistle in any of Eusebius’s works.

30. Concerning the book of the Revelation, we have seen
 people’s notions and opinions represented in Eusebius: by
 some it was rejected, by others it was received. We may be
 apt to conclude from Eusebius’s accounts, as before observed,
 that this book was very generally received, by many more,
 however, than it was rejected.

31. As for Eusebius’s own opinion, it does not appear, that
 he received it as a book of the New Testament. Indeed it is
 often mentioned by him in his Ecclesiastical History, as he
 cites the passages of ancient authors. ‘ In^k this persecution,
 ‘ [under Domitian], it is reported, that John the apostle and
 ‘ evangelist, being yet alive, was banished into the island Pat-
 ‘ mos for the testimony of the word of God. And Irenæus,
 ‘ writing about the number of the name of Antichrist, men-
 ‘ tioned^l in the Revelation ascribed to John, speaks of John
 ‘ in these very words.’ Afterwards, in the same book of the
 Ecclesiastical History, he quotes the Revelation in this man-
 ner: ‘ About^m this time,’ says he, ‘ was the heresy, called the
 ‘ heresy of the Nicolaitans, which continued for a short time;
 ‘ ofⁿ which also the Revelation of John makes mention.’ But

¹ — ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς αὐτοῦ
 οὐδὲ μὴτε τῆς οἰκίας προσήγορας πάλαι-
 ῶν, ἢ πρεσβύτερον αὐτοῦ, οὐνομαζει. κ. λ.
 Dem. Ev. l. iii. c. 5. p. 120. D.

^k H. E. l. iii. c. 18.

^l — ἐν τῇ

Ἰωάννη λεγόμενῃ ἀποκαλύψει. ib. p. 88. D.

^m L. iii. c. 29. in.

ⁿ ἧς δὲ καὶ ἡ

τῇ Ἰωάννῃ ἀποκαλύψει μνημονεύει. ib.

he does not here clearly declare his own opinion for the authority of that book.

32. That he was not positive of its being written by John the apostle and evangelist, is apparent from a passage^a quoted formerly about Papias, where he says: 'It^b is likely, that the Revelation, which goes under the name of John, was seen by the second, if not by the first;' that is, by John the elder, if not by John the apostle.

33. Nor can I say, that Eusebius has in any of his works quoted the Revelation, in the way of proof of any doctrine. He does indeed refer to it^c sometimes: and he quotes it in^d his Demonstration. But it appears to me very remarkable, that in the long Commentary upon the Psalms, and in the Commentary upon Isaiah, there is not one quotation of this book, nor, I think, any notice taken of it. In the Commentary on the Psalms there are numerous quotations out of the gospels and Acts; all Paul's epistles are quoted, except the epistle to Titus, and most of them often; the epistle of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John, are also quoted there: but not one word from the book of the Revelation. It is farther to be observed, that in the Commentaries upon the Psalms and Isaiah, he had many fair occasions for quoting this book; his argument often led him to do so, and he could not but think of it; nevertheless, not one word about it, that I remember. He seems to me, therefore, studiously to have avoided all notice of the Revelation. I suppose that every one, who reads those Commentaries, may be sensible of the truth of what I say. It is not possible to transcribe passages at length, but for the easier satisfaction of the curious, I refer to some places in the Commentary^e upon the Psalms, and^f Isaiah, where it is likely, he would have taken some notice of this book, if he had not purposely declined it. In his comment upon Ps. xcv. he speaks much of a *new song* to be sung to God; but still makes no reference to any place of the Revelation, though it was hard to avoid it; see Rev. v. 9. xiv. 3. xv. 3. not to add any other places of that book, which he could have made use of, if he had seen fit.

34. It may be also reckoned a confirmation of this supposition, that in the place cited not long ago concerning St. John's

^a See Vol. ii. p. 107, 108.

^b Εἰκος γὰρ τὸν δεύτερον, ἢ μὴ τις εὐδαίμων πρῶτος, τὴν ἐπ' ὀνομαστος φερομένην Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλύψιν εὐρακέναι. l. iii. c. 39. p. 111. D.

^c De Vit. Const. l. iii.

^d c. 33. ^e κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαλύψιν Ἰωάννου. Dem. l. viii. p. 386. D.

^f In Pf. p. 204, 204.

^g In If. p. 455. A. B. C. 459. C. D. 460. B. 577. A. B. 579. B. C. D. 587. A. 593. A.

modesty, he makes no mention of this book, though he instanceth in the epistles, as well as the gospel. I do not well see, how Eusebius could excuse himself in omitting intirely the Revelation, if he thought it to be written by the apostle John.

35. It may be said, that it was not to his purpose to speak of the Revelation, in which the writer often mentions himself by name. To which I answer, that it was easy for Eusebius to have added: And as for the book of the Revelation, though he mentions himself by name, he does not call himself apostle or evangelist. Or he should have proposed the objection, that might be reasonably made, if the apostle, whose modesty he celebrates, was the author of that book. It seems to me, that the only good reason assignable for Eusebius's silence about the Revelation in that place, is, that he was not satisfied it was written by John the Apostle.

36. But whatever may be thought of this last observation, I insist upon the foregoing particulars, as probable arguments, that the Revelation was not esteemed by Eusebius a book of the highest authority.

37. It is not unlikely, that the learned and critical argument of Dionysius of Alexandria was of great weight with Eusebius, and many others about that time. And our author's aversion to all the schemes of the Millenarians, which this book was made use of to support, induced him to take as little notice of it as possible, though it was in great esteem with many.

38. I apprehend, that from the time of Dionysius, the credit of this book declined in the east, though it was still received by some: which gave occasion to Jerom to say, it "was not received by the Greek Christians of his age.

39. Upon the whole, this learned Christian bishop received, as sacred scripture, the four gospels, the Acts, and thirteen epistles of Paul; he has often quoted the epistle to the Hebrews as his: and it is generally supposed, that he received it as one of Paul's epistles. I think likewise, that he was well disposed to that sentiment; nevertheless, I suspect, that he had doubts, and was not clear and positive on that side the question. He received besides, the first epistle of Peter, and first epistle of John, as undoubtedly genuine, and therefore also of the highest authority. Of all the five disputed catholic epistles,

^a Quod si eam [ad Hebr. Epistolam.] libertate suscipiunt. Et tamen nos utramque suscipimus. Hier. ad Dardan. T. ii. p. 608. f. Ed. Bend.
 Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas: nec Graecorum quidem Ecclesiae Apocalypsin Johannis eadem

he seems to be most favourable toward that of James: for he has quoted it several times, and reckons the writer to have been a disciple and brother of the Lord, and apostle in a secondary sense, and next to the twelve and Paul. The other four disputed catholic epistles are scarce ever quoted by him; and the book of the Revelation very rarely. However, he is not averse to allow, that the two latter epistles, called John's, were written by the elder of that name. In like manner he seems to allow the antiquity of the book of the Revelation; and that it was written by John the elder, if not by John the apostle. Nor does it appear, that he had any exceptions to make to the doctrine of this book, as containing any thing contrary to the catholic and ecclesiastical principles. But he was somewhat prejudiced against it, because many people, as he thought, made a wrong use of it. It is highly probable, that in the argument of Dionysius, which is largely transcribed into ^w the Ecclesiastical History, we have the sense of our author himself, as well as of that learned bishop of Alexandria.

X. I believe, this may be a proper place for us, to take notice of the contradicted books spoken of by Eusebius in the passages above cited from his Ecclesiastical History.

Several of them are now in our canon, and have been considered in the preceding section. The reader clearly discerns what books I mean: the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, the second epistle of Peter, the epistle of Jude, the second and third of John, and the Revelation. The rest mentioned by Eusebius, as 'contradicted,' or 'spurious,' or 'altogether spurious,' are these.

1. The epistle of Barnabas, placed among spurious by ^x Eusebius in our second passage from him; and in some other places ^y called by him a 'contradicted' book. Of this epistle I have spoken distinctly in the first volume of the second part of this work: I suppose it ^z to be a genuine work of the person to whom it is inscribed; nevertheless it is justly placed by Eusebius among contradicted books of scripture, or even among spurious: that is, among such books as were generally reckoned not to be a part of the New Testament. That he is in the right in so doing, appears from our observations upon the several ancient Christian writers, who have made use of this epistle, but do not quote it as of the highest authority. How it is quoted by Clement of Alexandria, may be seen Vol. ii. p.

^w See H. E. lib. vii. c. 24, 25. And *Εκ επιβολη*. H. E. l. iii. c. 25. p. 97. C. the third volume of this work, p. 102—108. ^y Ib. l. vi. c. 13. p. 214. D. c. 14. p.

^x — *εν τοις νεβοις—η φερουμένη Βαρναβα* 215. C. ^z See Vol. ii. p. 13.

12, 232. how by Origen, may be seen in Vol. ii. p. 12, 497, 498. The reason of not placing this epistle in the number of books of the highest authority, I have supposed to be this: that the writer was not reckoned to be, properly speaking, an apostle, as has been hinted several^a times.

2. Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, undoubtedly a genuine work of the author to whom it is ascribed: yet placed by^b Eusebius among contradicted books, and justly, because very few have thought it to be a part of the New Testament; forasmuch as the writer was not an apostle. How quoted by Irenæus, may be seen by the reader, if he pleases, Vol. ii. p. 174, 175. how by Clement of Alexandria, Vol. ii. p. 233. how by Origen, Vol. ii. p. 498.

3. The Shepherd of Hermas, in our second passage from Eusebius placed by him^c among spurious books, in the third passage said^d to be contradicted by some. It is, probably, a genuine writing of Hermas, but has no right to be a part of sacred scripture; as evidently appears from the ancient writers which have used it, and our observations upon them. How it is quoted by Irenæus, may be seen Vol. ii. p. 173, 174. how by Clement of Alexandria, Vol. ii. p. 233. how by Origen, Vol. ii. p. 500—502.

4. The gospel according to the Hebrews, in our second passage from^e Eusebius placed among spurious books: and said to be chiefly used by the Hebrew Christians. In another place he says, it^f was the only gospel received by the Ebionites. I defer till another time shewing at large what it was: however, I have already declared my opinion about it in general; that^g probably, the^h ground work of it is St. Matthew's gospel, withⁱ additions of things taken out of St. Luke's, and perhaps the^j other gospels, and of other matters handed down by oral tradition. And I have at times shewn, how it is quoted by several ancient writers; as Clement of Alexandria, Vol. ii. p. 234, 235. and by Origen, Vol. ii. p. 503—505.

5. Doctrines of the apostles, mentioned by^k Eusebius in our second passage from him, and placed among spurious books. For a farther knowledge of this book I refer to^l Usher and Grabe.

However, I shall put down here a few observations which offer themselves.

^a See Vol. ii. p. 234. note E, and p. 238—260. ^b I. vi. c. 13. p. 214. D.

^c J. iii. c. 25. p. 97. B.

^d Irenæus. ^e Irenæus. ^f Irenæus. ^g Irenæus. ^h Irenæus. ⁱ Irenæus. ^j Irenæus. ^k Irenæus. ^l Irenæus.

^h —εν τοις ⁱ Usher. Prolegom. in Ignat. Epist. cap. ^j Grabe Spic. Tom. i. p. 40. &c.

^k H. E. l. iii. c. 27. p. 99. C.

1.) This book is placed by Eusebius with spurious writings: therefore it is plain, that it was not of undoubted authority.

2.) This is the first and only mention which we have of this book in Eusebius: nor has he informed us at any time, that it was made use of by ancient writers. It is not one of the books of scripture mentioned by Irenæus; it is not in any of Origen's catalogues of sacred books: and though our author takes particular notice of Clement of Alexandria having written brief notes upon all books of scripture, not omitting the contradicted, this is not named by him: which may make us suspect, that it is not a very ancient book, but composed after the time of Irenæus, and Clement, and Origen, in our author's own time, or not long before. After this we find it mentioned in Athanasius's Festal Epistle¹ among other books not canonical, and in the ^m Synopsis ascribed to him, and in some other authors; particularly in Epiphanius, if ⁿ Grabe be in the right. The doctrine of Peter is quoted in Rufinus's Latin translation of Origen's Principia, in^o the preface. That may have been a part of what is called the Doctrines of the Apostles: if that passage be really Origen's, he had little respect for the book there referred to.

It is observed by Usher and Grabe, that whereas in our Greek copies of Eusebius this book is expressed in the plural number, Rufinus's^p translation has it in the singular, as also the Festal Epistle, and the Synopsis just mentioned.

3.) That this book is not the same as the Apostolical Constitutions, is argued by the fore-mentioned learned writers from three considerations. (1.) In the Festal Epistle of Athanasius, the Doctrine of the Apostles is reckoned among those books which are proper for Catechumens; whereas the Constitutions are rather reckoned to be for bishops. (2.) The Doctrine of the Apostles was a small book^q, consisting of two hun-

^k l. vi. c. 14.

^l — οὐ καὶ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῷ παλαιῷ ἀναγνωσκόμενα. τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος λαλῶντες καὶ διδάχῃ καλεσμένοι τῶν ἀποστόλων. Ep. Fest. Ath. T. i. p. 963. A. ^m Διδαχὴ ἀποστόλων. Athan. T. ii. p. 202. A.

ⁿ Equidem id libens concedo, Doctrinam Apostolorum ab Eusebio & Athanasio memoratam fuisse eandem cum Διδαχῇ, sive Constitutione Apostolica, ab Epiphanio aliquoties laudata. Grabe Spic. T. i. p. 41.

^o Si vero quis velit nobis proferre ex illo libello, qui Petri doctrina appellatur, ubi Salvator videtur ad discipulos dicere, 'non

^p sum dæmonium incorporeum: primo respondendum est ei, quoniam ille liber inter libros ecclesiasticos non habetur. Et ostendendum quia neque Petri est ipsa scriptura, neque alterius cujusquam, qui spiritu Dei fuerit inspiratus. Orig. Opp. T. i. p. 49. B. C.

^q — quamvis Rufinus in sua versione posuerit in numero singulari: doctrina quæ dicitur Apostolorum: &c. Grabe, ib. p. 40.

^r Exiguus ille 200 versiculorum numerus, quibus illa Διδαχὴ tum in Græco Nicephori Constantinopolitani textu, tum in Latina Anallæ Bibliothecarii interpretatione, constare ostenditur: quod Salomonis Canticorum

dred lines or verses, according to Nicephorus; which is less than the book of Canticles, containing two hundred and eighty lines: certainly this but little suits the huge volume of the Clementine Constitutions. (3.) In an ancient catalogue of canonical and apocryphal books of scripture, the ' Doctrine of the Apostles is mentioned as distinct from the Doctrine or Institution of Clement.

4.) If this book is not the same as the Apostolical Constitutions, these last are no where mentioned by our author in any of his writings: there is therefore no reason, why I should as yet take any particular notice of them.

6. The Gospel of Peter, placed by * Eusebius in our second passage from him among books altogether spurious, composed by heretics; and in the like manner in our ' third passage from him. I have said enough concerning this in the chapters of * Serapion, and * Origen.

7. The Gospel of Thomas, in our second passage from * Eusebius, placed likewise among forgeries of heretics, altogether absurd and impious: nor do I remember, that this gospel is any where mentioned by Eusebius in accounts of the quotations of ancient authors, or upon any occasion whatever. I gave some account of this gospel ' formerly.

8. The Gospel of Matthias, likewise placed by our * author in the second passage, among heretical forgeries, and no where else mentioned by him. The traditions of Matthias were before taken notice of by us in the chapter of * Clement of Alexandria.

9. The Preaching of Peter is placed by ^b Eusebius in the third passage among heretical scriptures. I have already given an account of this book in the chapters of * Clement of Alexandria, * Origen, and * Lactantius.

10. Acts of ' Peter and * Paul, reckoned by our author in the second, and in the third passage, either as heretical or spurious, and not generally received. Of these likewise I have had occasion to speak before in the chapters of ^a Clement of

libello minorem eam fuisse evincit, quem
880 ejusdem συγγρ. habuisse ibidem legimus.
Usser. ib. ^a Indiculus librorum ca-
nonicorum & apocryphorum, quem Anasta-
sius Nicæni Quæstionibus subjectum in pub-
lica Oxoniensis Academiæ Bibliotheca in-
venimus: ubi διδασκαί των αποστολων &
διδασκαλία κλημεντος, ut distincta opera
recensentur, & in scriptorum apocryphorum
censu pariter reponuntur. Usser. ib.

* Euseb. l. iii. p. 97. D. ^c ib. p.
72. A. ^a Vol. ii. p. 247. ^w Vol.
ii. p. 307. ^x l. iii. p. 97. D.
^y Vol. iii. § 6. sub fin. ^z l. iii. p. 97. D.
^a Vol. ii. p. 240, 241. ^b l. iii. p.
72. A. ^c Vol. ii. p. 236—239.
^d Vol. ii. p. 307. ^e In this vol. p.
85, 86. ^f l. iii. p. 97. B. ^g p. 72.
A. C. ^h Vol. ii. p. 240.

Alexandria, and ¹Origen. Beausobre supposeth the Acts of Peter to be a work of * Leucius.

11. Acts of Andrew and John, and other apostles, in our second passage, ranked by ^kEusebius among heretical forgeries. For these the reader is referred to several ¹places, where I have already had occasion to speak of them.

12. Revelation of Peter, in the second passage from ⁿEusebius placed among spurious, in the ⁿthird among heretical writings, in another place ^oamong contradicted. Some account was given of this book ^pin the chapter of Clement of Alexandria. Sozomen assures us, that ^qthough this book was entirely, or universally rejected by the ancients as spurious; yet in his time it was read once in the year in some churches of Palestine on a Friday, when they fasted in remembrance of our Saviour's passion. Sozomen in the ^rsame place speaks of a book called Paul's Revelation, which was respected by some monks of his time: though it was altogether unknown to the ancients, and was absolutely spurious, as he shews.

13. This may suffice for an account of these books, mentioned by Eusebius: he takes little or no notice of them in any other part of his writings. What was their authority, or value, appears from the places which I have referred to, as well as from the character here given of them by our ecclesiastical historian.

XI. It has been of late a common opinion, that Eusebius thought St. Matthew wrote his gospel at about eight years after our Lord's ascension. Some found this supposition upon a passage in his Ecclesiastical History, as ^sMill, whose words upon this occasion I place at the bottom of the page; others upon the Chronicle, as ^tJones.

ⁱ Vol. iii. p. 328—330.
de Manich. T. i. p. 394.

¹ See Vol. iii. p. 20, 23, 25. Vol. vi.

§ 6. sub fin. ^m p. 97. B.

ⁿ p. 72. A. ^o l. vi. c. 14. in.

^p Vol. ii. p. 240.

^q Οὕτω γὰρ τὴν καλημένην ἀποκαλύψαν πύρην, ὡς νοθοὶ πάν-
τηλας πρὸς τῶν ἀρχαίων δοκιμασθεῖσαι, ἐν
τίσιν ἐκκλησιαῖς τῆς παλαιῆς ἐστὶν νῦν
ἀπαξ ἑκάστῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναβιβασκομένην εἰσάγειν,
ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ παρασκευῆς, καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἀσπᾶς
ὁ λαὸς κατεῖται ἐπὶ ἀναμνησεὶ τοῦ σωτήρι-
ου παθῆος. Sozom. l. vii. c. 19. p. 735. C.

^r Τὴν δὲ νῦν ὡς ἀποκαλύψαν Παῦλὸς τῇ
ἀποστολῇ φερόμενον, ἢ ὑδὲς ἀρχαίων εἶδος,
πλεῖστοι μνηστῶν ἐπαινοῦσι. ^s ibid.

^t Licet enim Eusebius (quem secuti sunt
Euthymius, Theophylactus, ac Codices fere

ms. evangeliorum in υπογραφῇ, evange-
lii hujus calci suffixis:) scripserit eum
ad annum Domini xli. h. e. ex ipsius rati-
onibus viii. a Christi passione fixam velit:
[sumit nimirum pro concessio, apostolos post
notitiam ostii gentibus patefacti, statim con-
venisse de evangelio per orbem terrarum
prædicando: ideoque & Matthæum paulo
ante discessum ab Hierosolymis, hortatu
fidelium istius loci, evangelicam suam histo-
riam concinnasse. H. E. l. iii. c. 24.]
Tamen Irenæus, &c. Mill. Proleg. num.
61. ¹ Eusebius in his Chronicon hæc
placed the writing of St. Matthew's gospel
in the third year of Caligula: that is, eight
years after Christ's ascension, or the year
of Christ 41. Jones of the Canon. Vol. iii.
p. 60.

As for the argument from the Chronicle, it is of no manner of force: for there is no such thing in it. It is indeed said^a in Pontac's edition of the Chronicle at the vulgar year of Christ xli. 'Matthew first writes his Gospel in Judea:' but the editor had those words printed in Italic, to denote, that he did not think them genuine, as being wanting in most (D), and the best manuscripts and editions: accordingly Joseph Scaliger did not insert them in his edition of Eusebius's Chronicle.

As for the Ecclesiastical History, in our first passage^v formerly taken from him, he says, that^x 'when Matthew was about to go to other people, he delivered his Gospel to the Hebrews in their own language.' But he does not there, or any where else, say, when Matthew left Judea.

Theophylact^y in the eleventh century, and^z Euthymius in the twelfth, say, that Matthew wrote in the eighth year after our Saviour's ascension. Nicephorus Callisti^a in the fourteenth century, says, Matthew wrote about fifteen years after Christ's ascension: and the Paschal Chronicle, in the seventh century, intimates the same^b thing. None of these writers expressly refer to more ancient authors for their opinion: but it may be reckoned probable, that they collected it from the history in the Acts, and from the fore-mentioned passage of Eusebius. They who thought, that Matthew and the other apostles left Judea soon after the conversion of Cornelius at Cæsarea, supposed his Gospel might be written in the eighth year of our Lord's ascension. They who thought, that^c the apostles did not leave Judea to go to the Gentiles, till after the council of Jerusalem, Acts xv. supposed Matthew's Gospel to have been written in the fifteenth year of our Lord's ascension, of the vulgar account forty-nine: but neither had for their opinion the express authority of Eusebius, or any other very ancient

^v Matthæus in Judæa evangelium primus scribit, p. 57.

(D) As Pontac's edition is scarce, I shall here put down his note upon these words: Desunt in A. F. H. M. septem Vaticanis. Vi. O. Pi. Fux. P. Lo. & tribus MSS. Fab. Mar. Fre. Nec ex alio loco vel scriptore vetere constat, quo anno Matthæus scripserit: nisi quod ipse Eusebius lib. v. H. E. c. 8. refert verba Irenæi scribentis, Matthæum historiam evangelii composuisse tunc, cum Petrus & Paulus Romæ evangelizarent, quod non contigit ante annum 44 Christi. Et juxta hanc sententiam facile crederem ista hic fuisse appiecta. Pontac. Annot. p. 359.

^x H. E. l. iii. c. 24. p. 95. A.

^y See before, p. 225.

^z ——— *μεία*

οὐδὲν εἶη τῆς Χρίστου ἀναλήψεως. Theoph. ap. Mill. N. T. p. 3.

^z Euthym. ibid. p. 4.

^a *Μεία* εἰ εἶη τῆς Χρίστου ἀναλήψεως.

Niceph. l. ii. c. 45. p. 213. B.

^b Εκ τῆς δικνύλαι, οἱ καὶ τὰς καθολικὰς αὐτῶν οἱ ἀποστόλοι τοῖς γραφῶσιν, πρὸ τῆς διασπορᾶς αὐτῶν ——— ἀλλὰ καὶ Ματθαῖος πρῶτος ἐκεῖ εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα γραφεῖ το ἐναγγελιστοῖ, ὡς λέγει χρυσοστόμος. Οἰμαι δι. Chr. Pasch. p. 233. C.

^c Certe Athanasius in tractatu de libris sacre scripturæ, & Chrysostomus scribit Matthæum primum omnium Hierosolymis evangelium suum conscripsisse: idque anno xv. post ascensum Christi ab eo factum fuisse, tradit Nicephorus, & auctor Chronici Alexandrini. Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. l. iii. c. 24.

writer. It is well known to be very common to insert articles in Chronicles, and such like works: this article, concerning the time of Matthew's Gospel, is probably a late addition.

I am of opinion, that Mill has judiciously followed Irenæus, in placing St. Matthew's gospel about the year of Christ LX. Whose account I suppose to be favoured by Origen, and other writers of the first three centuries: but I must not now stay to allege all the reasons and arguments for that date.

XII. Eusebius affords us divers critical remarks upon the New Testament.

'Which also,' says he^d upon Pf. lxxvii. or, as in our Bibles, lxxviii. 2. 'the scripture of the sacred^e gospels teaches, where it is said: *All^f these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables. And without a parable spake he not unto them, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying: I will open my mouth in parables: I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation. For^g instead of, I will speak dark sayings of old, [or from the beginning], Matthew as being a Hebrew, uses a translation of his own, saying: I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation. Instead of which Aquila has translated: I will pour down things which have been enigmatical from the beginning. And Symmachus: I will cause to spring up ancient dark sayings.'*

One might be apt to argue hence, that our learned commentator supposed Matthew to have written in the Greek language: and that being by birth a Hebrew, and well understanding the original language of the Old Testament, when he quoted texts from thence, he did not always take the Greek version of the Seventy, but translated for himself, as he saw good. So^h Montfaucón seems to have understood Eusebius. For he says: 'Since Matthew, according to the testimony of Irenæus, Origen, and Eusebius himself [in other places], and Jerom, wrote his gospel in Hebrew; certainly Matthew did not use a Greek interpretation of his own: but expressed the Hebrew words in the Syro-Chaldaic tongue, such as was then in use among the Jews, as may be perceived in the expression Lamma Sabachtani, and not a few other. By which it is evident, that Matthew in his gospel written in Hebrew, when any texts occurred out of the Old Testament, expressed them in the

^d In Pf. lxxvii. p. 463. D. E.

^e Η των ιερων ισαγγελων γραφη. Ib. E.

^f Matt. xiii. 34, 35.

^g Αλη γαρ, τε φθιγξομαι προβλεματα απ' αρχης, Εβραιος αν ο Ματθαιος οικεια εκδοσει κεχηρη-
ται ιπταν Ερηξομαι κεχηρηματα απο κατα-

βολης ανθ' ο μιν ακυλας Ομβρησιν ανι-
ματα εξ αρχης, εκδιδωκει. Ο δε συμμαχος
Αναβλεσων προβλεματα αρχαια. Ib. E.

^h Vid. Prelim. in Euseb. in Pf. cap. 9.
§ 1.

‘ Syro-Chaldaic language: but whether he used an interpretation of his own, or took those texts out of some version before made, is not easily determined. But afterwards the Greek translator (who he is, St. Jerom says is uncertain) used an interpretation of his own, without following the Septuagint version.’ It seems to me therefore, that Montfaucon understood Eusebius to say here, though contrary to what he supposes him to say elsewhere, that Matthew writing in Greek did not follow the Seventy, but translated for himself out of the Hebrew tongue. And I own, that this appears to me the most natural meaning of our author’s own words. But of this more by and by.

2. Eusebius has another like observation upon John, which deserves to be taken notice of on its own account: and more especially as it may serve to illustrate the preceding observation, and I think confirm the sense in which I take it. It is in his Commentary upon Ps. xl. 10. otherwise Ps. xli. 9. ‘ Therefore it is’ said, *Has lift the sole of his foot against me.* But instead of *sole of the foot*, which is the expression used by the Seventy, the Hebrew reading imports *heel*. And so therefore Aquila, who strictly follows the Hebrew, has rendered it. For which reason also the evangelist John, as being a Hebrew descended of Hebrews, recording the words of our Saviour, does not use the expression, *sole of the foot*, but *heel*.’ See John xiii. 18.

3. Once more, upon Ps. ii. 7. *This day have I begotten thee.* But ^k the Jew (whom I before mentioned) said, that the proper meaning of the word is, *I brought forth*, which is also the version of Aquila. But the apostle, being skilled in the law, in the epistle to the Hebrews, has followed the Seventy.’ See Heb. i. 5.

Here Eusebius plainly ascribes the epistle to the Hebrews to St. Paul: for by ‘ the apostle,’ he certainly means him; and he only of the apostles was learned in the law. But it may be questioned by some, whether it be herein implied, that St. Paul wrote that epistle in Greek; or only, that writing in the Syro-Chaldaic language, then in use among Jews, he used a word of the same import with that in the Greek version of the

ⁱ Διο λεξιολογίας. Εμφανίζοντες ἐπ’ ἡμῶν πλεονασμούς. Αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν πλεονασμῶν, παρὰ τοῖς ἑρμηνεύταις, ἢ ἑβραϊκῇ ἀναγιγνωσκόμενοι πλεονάζοντες. Οὕτως ἐν δευτέρῳ τῶν ἑβραϊκῶν ἀκτῶν ἐξιδέσκει. Οὕτως καὶ ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς Ἰωάννης, ὡς ἀν’ ἑβραίων ἐκ ἑβραίων, τοὺς σωφιστικὰς πλεονασμούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλεονάζοντες ὡς μα-

κεναὶ ἐμφανισμένους. In. Ps. p. 171. D.

^k Ὁ μὲν τοῖς ἑβραίοις ἐλπίσιν κυρίως ἐν τῇ λέξει ἔλεγον, ὅπερ καὶ ἀκτῶν ἀποποιεῖται. Ὁ δὲ ἀποστόλος νομομαθὴς ὑπαρχὼν ἐν τῇ πρὸς ἑβραίους τῇ τῶν ὁ ἐκχρησάτο. Comm. in Ps. p. 15. E.

Seventy. But the former seems to me to be by far the most obvious meaning of our author's expressions.

For farther clearing this matter, I shall mention these following propositions.

1.) It seems to me, that the most natural and obvious meaning of Eusebius's words in these passages, both concerning Matthew's gospel, and the epistle to the Hebrews, implies a supposition, that they were written originally by the several authors in the Greek language: and if Eusebius had thought, that they were written in Hebrew, or Syriac, he would have given some hint of it, or have used some expressions, denoting that to be his opinion.

I do not say, that it is certain and evident from Eusebius's expressions, that he supposed these books were written in Greek: for, possibly, we ourselves might upon some occasion say, that instead of *I will speak dark sayings*, Matthew more closely imitating the Hebrew says: *I will utter things kept secret*, without implying thereby, that he wrote in English. Nevertheless, I think it must be allowed to be probable, that in one or other of these critical remarks upon Matthew's gospel, and the epistle to the Hebrews, some expression would have fallen from our author, denoting his opinion, that those books were not written in the Greek language used by himself in his Commentaries, if he had really thought so. And I presume, I may venture to appeal to any one, whether he can think, that Eusebius writing in Greek and criticising the Greek Epistle to the Hebrews, would say the apostle followed the Seventy, if he had supposed him to have written in Hebrew, or Syro-Chaldaic.

2.) It does not appear to me a clear point, that Eusebius was persuaded, that either Matthew's gospel, or the epistle to the Hebrews, was originally written in any language different from the Greek. It is true, he has mentioned several passages of ancient writers, where it is said, that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew: and a passage of Clement of Alexandria, where is also mentioned a tradition, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul in the same language, and that St. Luke translated it into Greek: and in another place Eusebius may be reckoned by some to deliver his own opinion on the same side. His words are: 'For ^a Paul having written to the Hebrews in their own language, some think

¹ L. iii. c. 39. p. 113. B. l. v. c. 8. p. 172. C. c. 10. p. 175. C. L. vi. c. 25. p. 226. B. Conf. & l. iii. c. 24. p. 95. B. ^a L. vi. c. 14. in. ^a L. iii. c. 38. in.

' that

that the evangelist Luke, others that this very Clement translated it [into Greek]. Which last is the more likely, since there is a resemblance between the style of the Epistle of Clement, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as between the sentiments of those writings.' But to me it seems, that these expressions cannot be relied upon, as representing Eusebius's own settled opinion: he may be as well understood even there to represent the more common accounts and traditions, without interposing his own judgment upon the point. And the critical passage, which we are now considering, may be as fairly reckoned to contain Eusebius's own opinion, as any in his works.

3.) Nor am I satisfied, that it was the settled opinion of many other learned Christians of those times, that the gospel of Matthew, and the epistle to the Hebrews, were written in the Hebrew tongue. If they had been persuaded of this, they would, some of them at least, have made enquiries after the originals. We have no proof that Eusebius, or any other of the Gentile Christian authors, quoted by him, or whose writings we have any where else met with, had seen any Hebrew copy of St. Matthew's gospel; nor any the least hint of a Hebrew copy of the epistle to the Hebrews to be found any where, or as used by any people whatever. Indeed, there was a Gospel called according to the Hebrews, much resembling Matthew's gospel, and in the Hebrew language: but it appears not to have been much respected by Eusebius, or any of the learned Christians whose works he was acquainted with: therefore it is manifest, they did not think it to be Matthew's original gospel.

If it should be said, that the ancient Christian writers, which we have any knowledge of, were Gentiles, and did not understand Hebrew; and for that reason they might not be inquisitive after the Hebrew originals, since they had a Greek translation; I answer, that they were not all strangers to the Hebrew language. And supposing only a very slight acquaintance with that language, and that there were but a very few only who had that, it is very likely there would have been inquiries made after the originals of those books by some, particularly by Origen and Eusebius, who were not absolute strangers either to the Hebrew language or learning. Even they who had none, or a very slight acquaintance with the Hebrew language, would have procured copies in the original language, and would have been at the pains to consult some Hebrew Christian, or even an unbelieving Jew, about the readings

readings in them, to compare them with the copies of the Greek translations. Did not Origen in his Commentaries? Does not Eusebius in his Commentaries upon the Psalms, and Isaiah, often compare the Hebrew with the Septuagint, and other Greek translations? and that, though the Septuagint version was in great esteem. Why then should they not have done the same in regard to the gospel of Matthew, and the epistle to the Hebrews, if they had thought the original to be Hebrew? Besides, if Matthew's gospel, and the epistle to the Hebrews, had been indeed thought to have been originally written in Hebrew, it is highly probable, there would have been several Greek translations of them; whereas we know not of any attempts of this kind, excepting only the first supposed translation.

Before I proceed, I would put the reader in mind, that I formerly examined the question, whether ^o Origen thought St. Matthew's Gospel to have been written in Hebrew: and that, if I mistake not, I shewed, that the ^r same great critic did not suppose the Epistle to the Hebrews to have been written in any other language than the Greek.

4.) To these observations I shall subjoin the sentiments of some learned moderns, favouring our argument.

The very learned and laborious I. A. Fabricius was of opinion, that both ^q Matthew's gospel, and the ^r epistle to the Hebrews, were written in Greek. So likewise thought ^s Lightfoot, whose judgment upon this point may be reckoned as valuable as that of most men: and Dr. Whitby in his Preface to the four gospels earnestly contends, that St. Matthew did not write in Hebrew.

I would also insert here the sentiment of Beaufobre, from his excellent preface to the epistle to the Hebrews.

^q Vol. ii. p. 541—543. ^p Ib. p. 477. ^q Græcum Matthæi interpretem Jacobum alii, alii Paulum, alii Lucam, denique vel Joannem, incerta fama tradiderunt: cum Matthæum ipsum Græce scripsisse, sit verius. Fabric. ad Hieron. cap. 3. de Vir. Ill. Vid. ejusd. Bib. Gr. T. iii. p. 126. ^r — Sed Græca quæ hodie habemus originarium esse auctoris sacri contextum argumentis non contemnendis post Calvinum probat laudatus Spanhemius, — Millius — Heideggerus — Blondellus — cum ex tota antiquitate ne unus possit proferri testis, qui Hebraicum viderit. Bib. Gr. T. iii. p. 160. ^s Having said, that Matthew's

gospel was written in Greek, and afterwards translated into Hebrew, he adds: ^t The same is to be resolved concerning ^u the original language of the epistle to the Hebrews. The epistle was written to the Jews inhabiting Judea, to whom the ^v Syriac was the mother-tongue; but yet it ^w was written in Greek for the reasons ^x above named. For the same reasons the ^y same apostle wrote in Greek to the Romans, although in that church there were ^z Romans, to whom it might seem more agreeable to have written in Latin: and ^a there were Jews, to whom it might seem ^b more proper to have written in Syriac. Lightfoot, Vol. ii. p. 104.

'The ancients,' says he, 'had no other reason to believe, that St. Paul wrote in Hebrew, than that he wrote to the Hebrews. But that reason, however probable it may appear, is not convincing; because it is certain, that the Greek tongue was understood in Judea, though it was not the vulgar tongue. All the writers of the New Testament wrote in Greek, though they wrote for all believers in general, whether Hebrews or Gentiles. Barnabas, or whoever is the author of the Epistle under his name, wrote to the Hebrews, and yet wrote in Greek. Works composed in this language were useful to more persons, and even to a greater number of Jews; for they who lived in Egypt and Asia spake Greek. In a word, they who talked of a Hebrew original, never saw it; and have supposed without proof what they imagined ought to have been.—Indeed almost all the passages of the Old Testament are here quoted according to the Seventy, not according to the Hebrew.—A man needs only to read the epistle to the Hebrews to know that it is not a version; it has altogether the air of an original: there is nothing of the constraint of a translator; nor are there those Hebrew phrases which are so common in the translation of the Seventy, and in that of Ecclesiasticus: for which reason we may be willing to assent to the opinion of Origen, who judges upon this question in a manner altogether worthy of his moderation and discernment. "If I was to speak my own opinion, I should say, that the thoughts [or sentiments] are the apostle's, but the language and composition of some one else, who committed to writing the apostle's sense, and as it were reduced into commentaries the things spoken by his master." The style then is not the apostle's: nevertheless that hinders not but the Epistle may be his, as to the thoughts and matter.' So that learned writer, who also adds; 'What therefore seems most probable upon the question is, that St. Luke, who accompanied St. Paul, and was with him at Rome, was his secretary: he wrote the epistle for the apostle, and according to his instructions; hence the difference of style and composition in this and the other epistles written by St. Paul alone.'

So writes Beausobre in the above-mentioned place. But since, he has said that he has been much disposed to think,

* Preface sur l'Épître de St. Paul aux Hébreux. § xv.—xviii.
 passage cited before, Vol. ii. p. 467.

* Plus je lis Philon, plus je soupçonne, qu' Apollos pourroit avoir écrit cette épître. Car certainement on y trouve quan-

that

that Apollos, of Alexandria, wrote this epistle. However, if he was the author, that can make no alteration in the opinion about the original language of the epistle: Apollos, very probably, would write in Greek.

XIII. I shall observe only a various reading or two.

1. We find quoted in our author more than once those words of Matt. xiii. 35. from Psalm lxxviii. 2. in this manner: *I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation: without* ^α *κοσμος*, of the world, which is now in our copies. It is probable therefore, that this text so stood in the copies used by Eusebius: and indeed, *of the world*, is not necessary. Mill has not taken any notice of this.

2. It may be worth the while to observe, that in his Commentary upon the lxxxviiith Psalm, Eusebius quoting Luke ii. 2. does not say, *Cyrenius governor of Syria*, but *this was the first survey*, or enrolment, of *Cyrenius, who governed Syria*. The reader, if he thinks fit, may consult what was said ^a formerly concerning this matter, before I had observed this passage of our author. This reading is not in Mill: Eusebius's Commentary upon the Psalms was published since his time. Perhaps this ought not to be reckoned a various reading: for I do not affirm, that Eusebius had any copy of the New Testament where *governed* was written; he may here only give the sense of the text. I would add, that in his Comment upon the preceding Psalm likewise he speaks of Cyrenius, as ^a the person by whom that survey was made, and of his coming into Judea for that purpose.

3. In the Commentary upon Ps. xvi. 1. otherwise xvii. 1. ^a The next words are: *Attend to my cry*. Which may be well ^a used by him who is tried, and in prayer sends up supplications to God: who presents not little and common requests, ^a nor asks of God earthly and mortal things. And ^b this our ^a Saviour also taught, saying: *Seek ye the great things, and the little shall be added unto you.* Compare Matt. vi. 33. Of this saying, as ascribed to our Saviour by Clement and Origen, I have spoken ^c formerly. This particular citation of it is not

tité de pensées & d'idées prises de Philon, dont apparemment Apollos avoit été disciple, étant Juif d'Alexandrie. Remarques sur le N. T. Tom. ii. p. 160.

^x — *πενθεμαι πενθυμινα απο καλαβολης*. In Ps. p. 462. D. Vid. supr.

^y *Αιτη η απογραφη περιη εινελο ψευδομυσταλιος της συριας κυρηνη*. In Ps. p. 543.

C. ^z See the first part of this work. Book ii. ch. 1. § 5.

^a — *οι κυρη* ^ν *νιος επιτας τη Ιουδαίη τας απογραφας ποιειλο*. p. 543. E.

^b *Τελος γαρ και ο σωτηρ ιδιδασκει, λεγων* ^δ *Αιτε τα μεγαλα, και τα μικρα προσεθησεται υμιν*. In Ps. p. 56. A.

^c See Vol. ii. p. 524, 525.

inserted in Grabe's, or other collections of such things, this Commentary of Eusebius not having been published till lately.

XIV. Though my design relates chiefly to scriptures of the New Testament, I cannot forbear to observe, (what our great author thought not proper to omit), that in his Ecclesiastical History there are three catalogues of the Books of the Old Testament, as received by the Jews. The first is that ^d of Josephus from his books against Apion: The second is that ^e of Melito bishop of Sardis: The third is taken from ^f Origen's works.

XV. It will not be amiss to put down here some instances of general divisions of sacred scripture, which are to be found in this writer.

He frequently uses a Greek word, literally denoting 'in the testament,' and generally, as equivalent to canonical: he uses it, when he proceeds to put down Josephus's ^f catalogue of the scriptures of the Old Testament. Clement of Alexandria, he says, wrote ^h brief Commentaries upon all the scriptures in-the-testament, not omitting those that are contradicted. The title of the chapter in which he inserts Origen's catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament is: How ⁱ he mentions the scriptures in-the-testament. He uses the same word, when he alleges ^k Irenæus's testimony to the New Testament: he elsewhere speaks ^l of books acknowledged by all, and others not in-the-testament, but contradicted. The same word is used by Origen. In his treatise of Prayer he observes, that ^m the Jews do not receive the book of Tobit as in-the-testament: it is also in Origen's passage alleged ⁿ by our author. Epiphanius uses a somewhat like phrase, when he says, the Alogians were of opinion, that ^o St. John's gospel ought not to be placed in the Testament, or be reckoned canonical.

Old ^p and New Testament is another common division: as also ^q prophets and apostles: gospels ^r and epistles.

^d H. E. l. iii. c. 9. & 10. ^e — l. iv. c. 26. f. ^f — l. vi. c. 25. in.

^g Τὴν ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῆς λεγούσης παλαιᾶς τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γραφῶν τήσιν. L. iii. c. 9. p. 85. A.

^h — παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς φράσεως. — l. iii. c. 14. in. ⁱ — ὅπως τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γραφῶν ἐμνημονεύσιν. L. vi. c. 25.

^k — τὰς περὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γραφῶν παραδόσεις. — l. v. c. 8. in.

^l — ἀνυμολογούμενας γραφάς, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας παρὰ ταύτας, ἐκ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς μὲν, ἁπλᾶ καὶ ἀνυμολογούμενας. L. iii. c. 25. p. 97. D. ^m Τῇ δὲ τῷ Τόβιτ βιβλίῳ ἀντιθέσιν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, ὡς μὴ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν.

Orig. T. i. p. 220. F.

ⁿ — ὡς πῶς γραφῶν κατὰ λέξιν. Οὐκ ἀγνοήσαντες δὲ εἶναι τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς βιβλίας, ὡς ἑβραίοι παραδίδουσι, δύο καὶ ἑκοστί. L. vi. c. 25. in. ^o Λέγουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγέλιον — ἀδιαθέσιον εἶναι. H. 31. p. 18. p. 441. C.

^p — τῇ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης κατὰ λόγον. L. vi. c. 25. in. — τῆς καὶ τῆς διαθήκης γραφῶν. L. iii. c. 25. in. & passim.

^q — προφητικῶν δηλαδὴ καὶ ἀποστολικῶν λόγων, οἷς ἐκκλησία τῆ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ποικιλοποιεῖται. In Pf. p. 414. E.

^r Τοῖς εὐαγγελικοῖς καὶ ἀποστολικοῖς ἀντιθέσιν. De Ec. Th. l. iii. p. 195. B.

XVI. The respect, which the ancient Christians had for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, appears in many things mentioned by this writer.

1. It is needless to insist here upon the epithets sacred and divine scripture, of which we have seen so many instances. To the like purpose are such expressions as these: the^a sacred gospel: according^t to the most certain testimony of the sacred gospels: the^u divine scripture of the gospels.

2. He says, there^w is no error or mistake in the scriptures: the prophets, according^x to his account, spake only as the Spirit dictated: they^y did not write their own words, but were employed by the Spirit of God.

3. In his Epistle to the church at Cæsarea, after signing the Nicene Creed, he says, that^z the use of unscriptural phrases had been the great cause of the dissensions and disturbances, that had happened in the churches.

4. He says, the^a first successors of the apostles, leaving their home, and performing the office of evangelists, went forth and preached the gospel to such as had not heard it; and then delivered to them the scripture of the gospels. From which passage, as well as from many others, it appears, that the gospels were then understood to be for general use.

5. Eusebius says of Origen, that^b from his childhood he was well versed in the divine scriptures.

6. According to our author, as cited^c formerly, the scriptures are the rule of faith, and the standard of orthodoxy. 'There are,' says he, 'beside these, treatises of many others, whose names we have not been able to learn: orthodox^d and ecclesiastical men, as the interpretations of the divine^e scripture given by each one of them manifest.'

7. In his Oration in praise of the emperor Constantine, demonstrating the truth of the Christian religion, our author testifies the great respect that was paid to the scriptures of the

^a Ταῦτα μὲν οἱ ἱεροὶ εὐαγγελιστοί. Dem. Ev. p. 418. B.

^t — καὶ τὴν ἀψευδιστὴν τῶν ἱερῶν εὐαγγελίων μαρτυρίαν. Dem. E. p. 301. A.

^u — ἡ θεία γραφή τῶν εὐαγγελίων. In Pf. p. 693. E.

^w Ἐρῶν δὲ δραστὴν καὶ προφήτην εἶναι ἡγεῖμαι το ἀποφθιασθαι τολμᾶν τὴν θείαν γραφὴν ἡμαρτησθαι. In Pf. p. 129. B. C. Conf. ibid. p. 66. D.

^x — δηλῶν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ προφητικὴ γλῶσσα, εἴρη τὴν χρωμένη αὐτῇ, αἰεὶ πνευματικός. In Pf. p. 187. D.

^y Οὐ γὰρ οἰκνᾷ ἐν ματαίᾳ προσεφίρον, τῇ δὲ θείᾳ πνευματικῇ βουλῇ διηγεῖσθαι. Ibid. p. 462. E.

^z — δια

το ἀπειρεῖν ἀλφαῖς χρησασθαι φησὶ· δι' οὗ σχιδὸν ἡ πᾶσα γίνεται σύγχυσις καὶ ἀκατάστασις τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. Ap. Socr. I. i. c. 8. p. 26. D. Thdr. I. i. c. 12. p. 39. D.

^a — ἱεροὶ ἐπίλοιποι εὐαγγελιστῶν, τοῖς ὅις πᾶσι πάντες ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως λόγῳ — καὶ τὴν τῶν θείων εὐαγγελίων παραδόξιν γραφὴν. H. E. I. iii. c. 38. p. 109. B. C.

^b — ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς ἐξ ἑλίου παιδὸς ἐνσηκνημένος. H. E. I. vi. c. 2. p. 202. C.

^c Vol. ii. ch. 32. p. 380. ^d Ὁρθόδοξον μὲν καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικόν, ὡς γὰρ δι' ἡ ἐκάστη παραδεκτικὴ τῆς θείας γραφῆς ἐρμηνεία. L. v. c. 27.

New Testament, and the great number of translations which had been then made of them. 'Who,' says he, 'ever delivered before-hand predictions of so many things, that were afterwards exactly accomplished in the event, as our Saviour did—to take men, originally employed in fishing, mean and illiterate, and constitute them lawgivers and masters of the universe of mankind: what and how mighty a work must this seem to you!' 'To engage to them by word and promise, and indeed *make them fishers of men*; and to confer upon them so great a virtue and power, as to compose writing, and publish books: and that these also should obtain such esteem, as to be translated into every language, both of Greeks and barbarians, throughout the whole world, and be diligently studied by all nations, and the things contained in them be believed to be divine oracles. How evident a demonstration is this of his divinity!'

8. In the last chapter of the third book of the Evangelical Demonstration is a like argument; where he says, that 'in a short space of time the gospel was preached throughout the whole world, for a testimony to all nations: and Greeks and barbarians had the scriptures concerning Jesus in their own letters and dialect.

9. Of reading the scriptures Eusebius speaks in this manner in his Evangelical Preparation: 'So likewise the Jewish scriptures had before [Plato] required, that faith should precede the examination and understanding of the divine scriptures, in such expressions as these: *If ye will not believe, ye shall not understand*; [so Eusebius from the Seventy, where we have, *Ye shall not be established.*] Again, *I believed; therefore have I spoken.* After which same manner with us [Christians] also, to those who are just brought over to us,

* Καὶ τοσαύτην αὐτοῖς ἀρίστην τε καὶ διὰ μὴν παρασχέτω, ὡς καὶ γραφὰς συνίσταται, καὶ βιβλὸς παραδίδωται· καὶ ταύτας εἰς τὸ σὸν κρῖναι, ὡς καθ' ὅλης τῆς οὐκ ἐκείνης αἰῶνος γλῶσσης βαρβαρῶν τε καὶ ἑλλήνων μὴ ἀλλομενῶν παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι μελλήσθαι, καὶ πιστευσθαι θεὰ εἶναι λόγια ταῦτα αὐτοῖς καὶ βεβλημένα· ὅταν εἰς ἀποδείξιν ἡμεῖς τῆς αὐτῆς διδύλης; De Laud. Const. c. 17. p. 662. C. D.

† Κικηρυκὶα γὰρ τὸ ἐναγλίον ἐν βραχείᾳ χρόνῳ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ εἰς μαρτυρίαν τοῖς ἔθνεσι· καὶ βαρβαροὶ καὶ ἑλλήνες τὰς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γραφὰς παλαιοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν καὶ παλαιοῦ φωνῇ μετὰλαλοῦσι. Dem. l. iii. p. 137. A.

‡ Εἰκότως δὲ τὰ καὶ ἡ ἑβραίων προφητεία

γραφῇ τῆς τῶν θεῶν γραφῶν συνίσταται τε καὶ διδύλης τὴν πίστιν προσαΐτιν, δι' ἣν φησὶν· Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ πιστεύσῃς, οὐ μὴ συνήλθῃς· Καὶ αὐτοῖς, Ἐπιστεύσα, διό καὶ ἡ ἀληθεύσα· Εἶθεν καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν τοῖς μὲν ἀπὸ ἐκείνων ἀναγνώσκειν παραδίδωται, μάλιστα δὲ τῶν πιστευόντων ὡς διὰ λόγους τοῖς ἐμφορομένοις παρακαλεῖσθαι. Τοῖς δὲ τῇ ἐξὶν προδεδωκοσὶ, καὶ πολλοῖς τὸ φροῦμα, ἐμδαθύνει καὶ δοκιμάζειν τὸν νοῦν τῶν λαομένων ἐπιλέγειν· ταῦτα δὲ πᾶσι τῶν ἑβραίων διδύλην φιλον ἢ οὐραζέτω, ὡς περὶ ἐρημικῆς καὶ ἐκκλησίας οὐκ ἔστι τῶν γραφῶν διατοκας. Præp. Ev. l. xii. c. 1. p. 573. D. 574. A.

§ If. vii. 9.

¶ Pl. cxvi. 10.

‘ and are as yet but weak, and as it were but infants as to their minds, the reading in the divine scriptures [that is, the divine scriptures themselves] is barely put into their hands, recommending it to them to believe the things therein contained as the words of God. But to those who are confirmed, and grown old in knowledge, it is allowed to penetrate farther, and search into the profoundest meaning of the words. Such as these the Jews call Deuterotæ, interpreters and expositors of the scriptures.’

It is hence apparent, that reading the scriptures was recommended even to new converts from heathenism.

10. In his Ecclesiastical History Eusebius says, ‘ that in his time it was customary for Christians, particularly the reclusive and devouter sort, to be more especially engaged in the attentive reading of the divine scriptures at the festival of our Saviour’s passion.’

11. I shall only add one passage more from the Commentary upon the Psalms; where Eusebius speaks of the public reading and explication of the scriptures. For he says, ‘ that in times of persecution, when discourses and readings of the divine scriptures are for the most part prohibited and hindered, and there are few or none found to impart spiritual food to the souls of men; the providence of God by an influx of the divine spirit nourisheth the souls of men, and causeth them to be taught of God: so that without the instruction of men they are nourished by a secret influence.’

XVII. What we have now seen in the works of this learned and laborious bishop, who flourished at about three hundred years after our Lord’s ascension, is an invaluable testimony to the things concerning the Lord Jesus himself and his apostles, and to the swift and wonderful progress of the gospel, and to the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The former were those received by the Jewish people. The number of the books of the New Testament does not appear to have been in his time settled by any authority, that was universally allowed of: but the books following were universally received, the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, thirteen epistles of Paul, one epistle of Peter, and one epistle of John. These, I say, were universally received by Christians in our author’s time, and had been all along received by the elders and churches of

^k H. E. l. ii. c. 17. p. 57. B.

ⁱ — εν γαρ τοις καιροις των διωγμων, καθ’ ους πολλοις κεκαλεινται μεν αι διδασκαλαι και των διωκουσων γραφων αιωθ-

ωσματα — ως και απουτης αυτων διδασκαλιας απορρηκται δυναμει τριφιδου. In Pl. 31. p. 128. A. B.

former times. Beside these, we now generally receive also an epistle to the Hebrews, an epistle of James, a second epistle of Peter, a second and third of John, an epistle of Jude, and the Revelation. And it appears from this learned writer, that these books or epistles were then next in esteem to those before-mentioned, as universally acknowledged; and were more generally received as of authority, than any other controverted writings. Beside these, there was the Gospel according to the Hebrews, made use of by the Jewish Christians; being, probably, a translation of St. Matthew's gospel, with some additions; and, as it seems, containing little or nothing contrary to the genuine doctrine of Christ and his apostles. The book called the Doctrine, or Doctrines of the Apostles, we have not now a distinct knowledge of; but, probably, it was a small book, containing the rudiments of the Christian religion, and fitted for the use of young people, and new converts, and never esteemed a part of sacred scripture. As for the rest, they were not very numerous, and their character is easily determined; for either they were useful ecclesiastical writings, as the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement, and the Shepherd of Hermas; which, as we have seen from the quotations of them in the writers of the first three centuries, were never received as of authority, or a part of sacred and canonical scripture: or they were mean, absurd, and fabulous compositions, despised and disliked by the founder Christians in general, both of our author's, and of former times. To the books of sacred scripture the greatest respect was shewn; they were esteemed as of authority, and decisive in all points of a religious nature; they were publicly read and explained in the assemblies of Christian people; and they were open to be freely read by all sorts of persons in private, for their instruction and improvement in religious knowledge, and their edification in virtue. Finally, it may be observed, that this learned author makes little use in his works of apocryphal scriptures of the Old Testament: none at all of Christian writings, forged with the names of Christ's apostles, or their companions.

C H A P. LXXIII.

MARCELLUS, BISHOP OF ANCYRA IN GALATIA.

1. I PUT in the margin Jerom's article ^a of Marcellus; but I do not think it needful to translate it.

2. Marcellus is spoken of by Cave, as flourishing about the year 330; but that time seems too late. It is generally supposed, that he was present at a council of Ancyra in 314, as bishop of that city. He was also at the ^b council of Nice in 325, where he signalized himself against the Arians. It is concluded from ^c Epiphanius, that Marcellus died in 372, when he had been bishop almost sixty years, and had lived almost or quite a century.

3. In the year 334, or 335, he wrote a book against Asterius and other Arians, which occasioned him a great deal of trouble. Socrates says, that ^d in opposing Asterius, Marcellus went into a contrary extreme, and embraced the opinion of Paul of Samosata, who says, that Jesus Christ is a mere man.

4. The bishops assembled at Jerusalem in 335, for dedicating the church built by Constantine, required him to renounce his opinion, and burn his book. But those bishops were hastily summoned to Constantinople; where, in the year 336, the matter was resumed. Marcellus was deposed, and Basil put in his room: but he was restored by the synod at Sardica in 347. Nevertheless, Marcellus still lay under the suspicion of heresy with many.

5. Sozomen says farther, that ^e the council of Constantinople wrote a letter to the churches of Galatia, admonishing them to reform their error, to search for the copies of Marcellus's book, and burn them.

6. That book was particularly answered by the famous Eusebius of Cæsarea, and by order ^f of the council itself. Though Marcellus was not then young, Eusebius says it ^g was the only

^a Marcellus, Ancyranus episcopus, sub Constantino & Constantio principibus floruit. Multaque diversarum ~~opinionum~~ scriptis volumina, & maxime adversus Arianos. Feruntur contra hunc Asterii & Apollinarii libri, Sabellianæ cum hæreseos arguentes. Sed & Hilarius in septimo adversum Arianos libro nominis ejus, quasi hæretici meminit. Porro ille defendit se non esse dogmatis cujus accusatur, sed communione Julii & Athanasii, Romanæ & Alexandri-

næ urbis pontificum, se esse munitum. De V. l. c. 86.

^b Vid. Epiph. H. 72. c. 2. p. 834. D. & Athan. Apol. contr. Arian. n. 32. p. 150. E.

^c Epiph. H. 72. n. 1.

^d Ψιλος γὰρ ἀθεώηται — ἰσομνησκὲν αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστόν. Soz. l. i. c. 36. p. 72.

^e Καὶ ταῖς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαις ἐστράψαι, ἀναζήτησαι τῆς Μακεδονίας, καὶ ἐξαφανίσαι. Soz. l. ii. c. 33.

^f Vid. Euf. contr. M. l. ii. p. 55. D.

^g Contr. M. l. i. c. 1. in.

book he had published. It was ^ha very large work, consisting of a thousand lines or verses. Eusebius takes notice, that ⁱ he quoted heathen authors to illustrate the scriptures: he likewise chargeth ^k him with a vain ostentation of secular learning; whether rightly or not, we can hence conclude, that Marcellus was learned. He did likewise quote very largely the books of the Old and New Testament: and we can plainly perceive from Eusebius's quotations and arguments, and from his own letter and confession of faith delivered to Julius, bishop of Rome, about the year 241, which are preserved in * Epiphanius, that Marcellus received the same scriptures that other Christians did, and paid them a like respect.

7. Socrates ^l and Sozomen ^m seem to have supposed, that Marcellus went into the opinion of Paul of Samosata. Eusebius continually chargeth him with ⁿ Sabellianism. Theodoret, in * his Heretical Fables, speaks of Paul, Sabellius, Marcellus, and Photinus, in four distinct chapters one after another: and in his introduction to that work he reckons him ^p with Ebion and Photinus, and elsewhere with ^{pp} Photinus and Paul of Samosata: and he particularly says of Marcellus, that [†] he denied a Trinity of persons. However, there were [‡] formerly, as well as ^{||} lately, different apprehensions concerning the real sentiments of Marcellus: and it must be owned, that there is a good deal of obscurity in some of his passages, cited by Eusebius: but it seems to me, that there is sufficient reason to think, he was a Sabellian or Unitarian.

8. Montfaucōn persuades ^q himself, and would persuade others, that not long before his death, about the year 372,

^h Ib. p. 2.

ⁱ p. 14. B. C.

^k Ib. c. 3. p. 16. D.

^l H. 72. n.

^m 3. p. 834—836.

ⁿ Socr. l. i.

^o c. 6. p. 72. Conf. l. ii. c. 19. p. 98, 99.

^p & cap. 20.

^{pp} Soz. l. ii. c. 33.

^q — πως ο δὲλος αὐτοῦ γενεῖο, τὸν μὲν

Σαβελλιὸν ἐπεδοκίμασε. Contr. Marc. l. i.

p. 5. A. Ἀνίκρυς τὸν Σαβελλιὸν ἀναγινώσκων.

De Ec. Th. l. ii. seu contr. Marc. l. iii. c. 1. p. 104.

Ὁρὰς ἰσχυροῦ ἀνίκρυς, τὸν μονοθεῖα υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ — ἀρνημένον. Ib.

cap. 2. p. 105. A.

^r Hæc. Fab. l. ii. c. 8, 9, 10, 11.

^s P Ταῦτες δὲ τῆς αἰρέσεως ἤξε μὲν Ἐβίων, μέχρι δὲ Μαρκέλλου καὶ Φωτεινῆς τὰς διαφορὰς ἐκτινοῖας ἐδείξατο.

Hæc. Fab. Compend. T. iv. p. 188. D.

^t P Φωτεινὸς γὰρ καὶ Μαρκέλλος, καὶ οἱ ἐκ Σαμοσατῆος Παῦλος, ἀνθρώπων μόνον εἶναι λέγουσι τοὺς κυρίους ἡμῶν καὶ θεοῦ. Epist. 104.

T. iii. p. 976. A.

^u Tαῖς ἀρνήσεσιν τῶν ἱεροσυνων τριάδα. H. F. l. ii. c. 10.

[†] Vid. Hieron. supra not. (a) p. 276.

Epiphani. H. 72. Tillemont collectis the

opinions of several ancients about him in

Marcel. d'Ancyre. Mem. T. vii. p. 510—

512. à Paris.

^v Vid. Zacagn. Pr. ad Collect. Monum. Gr. p. 42. &c. Mont-

fauc. Diatriba de Causa Marcelli ap. Nov.

Collect. Patr. T. ii. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. vi. p. 31. & 92. T. 8. p. 335.

^w Re comperta, Marcellus, ut eorum conatus &

molimina interpellaret, oratores qui causam

apud Athanasium suam agerent, ac sui,

Ancyranæque ecclesiæ nomine fidei pro-

fessionem emitterent, delegavit. Cumque

legatorum formula sanam prorsus & ortho-

doxam fidem præferret, huic Athanasius

cum aliis qui aderant episcopis adsupulatus,

litteras commendatitias rogantibus concessit.

Diatrib. de Marcell. cap. 5. p. 63. Ap.

Nov. Collection. Patr. T. ii.

Marcellus being uneasy at the accusations brought against him by St. Basil, as well as others, sent one of his deacons with others of his church, as a deputation to Athanasius, carrying with them a confession of faith, completely orthodox: which confession Athanasius, and other bishops of Egypt then present with him, accepted of, and gave them a letter of recommendation to communion with the churches.

9. But it seems to me, that this story is not well supported. Montfaucon does not well know when^r that deputation to Athanasius was sent; he placeth it in the year 372, by guess only. St. Basil, though he^r corresponded with Athanasius, and others of Egypt, knew nothing of that letter of recommendation; and in a letter written after that supposed date, in 377, reproves some^r people for communicating with the followers of Marcellus. Moreover, Chrysostom^a in his homilies, in the latter part of the fourth century, often argues against Marcellus as a heretic: not now to say any thing more of Socrates, and Sozomen, or Theodoret, or others, who appear not to have known any thing of this orthodox confession of Marcellus, or Athanasius's letter of communion.

It is indeed well known, and allowed, that for a while Athanasius had a kindness for Marcellus; and no wonder, when Marcellus, like himself, was so hard pressed by the Arians. But his respect for Marcellus seems to have abated afterwards: Hilary of Poitiers^r, and Sulpicius Severus^r expressly say, that Athanasius separated himself from his communion. Nor do I perceive, that^r what Epiphanius says, overthrows their accounts. For certain, he does not confirm, but weaken the credit of the story told by Montfaucon; for he says nothing of it, though he had a fair occasion to mention it, and wrote but a few years after the death of Marcellus and Athanasius.

^r Hæc porro legatio in annum 372, commode referatur. Diatrib. cap. 6. p. 64.

^s Cui frequens cum Athanasio epistolarum usus erat. Montf. Diatrib. ib.

^t At Basilus—quia semel conceptam de Marcelli impietate opinionem vix misisse facere poterat, cum Diocæsariensibus patribus non leviter expostulat, quod Marcellianos ad communionem, inconsultis aliis episcopis, admiserint. [Vid. Basil. Ep. 265. el. 293. T. iii. p. 410. edit. Bened.] Hæc Basilus, vel ignorans ea, quæ Alexandria in gratiam Marcelli & affectuum

ab Athanasio gesta fuerant; vel, &c. Montf. Diatrib. ib. p. 66.

^u Vid. in ep. ad Philip. hom. 6. T. xi. p. 234, 235. in ep. ad Heb. hom. 2. p. 14, 15, 16. hom. 8. p. 89. T. xii. Bened. & passim.

^x Nam negata sibi ab Athanasio communionem, ingressu sese ecclesiæ Marcellus abstulit. Hilar. Fragm. 2. p. 1300.

^y Interjecto deinde tempore, Athanasius, cum Marcellum parum sanæ fidei esse penitus comperisset, a communionem suspendit. Sulp. Sev. Hist. l. ii. c. 52. p. 389.

^z Vid. II. 72. n. 4. p. 837.

C H A P. LXXIV.

EUSTATHIUS, BISHOP OF ANTIOCH.

1. SAYS Jerom, 'Eustathius' of Side in Pamphylia, first governed the church at Beræa, and afterwards at Antioch. 'As he wrote much against the Arian doctrine, he was banished in the time of the emperor Constantine to Trajanopolis in Thrace, where he lies buried to this day. There are extant his volumes concerning the soul, of the Pythoness against Origen, and an infinite number of epistles, which it would be tedious to reckon up.'

2. Eustathius is placed by Cave at the year 325, when the council of Nice met: but as Eustathius was before that bishop of Beræa, if not also of Antioch, and was then so considerable, as to be thought by many to be the bishop who complimented Constantine in a short oration at his entrance into the council, I presume, he ought to be placed sooner, about the year 320.

3. For a particular account of him I refer to ^b Cave, and others. I observe some few of the more material things, and briefly only.

4. By 'means of the intrigues of Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice, he was deposed by a synod at Antioch, about the year 328, as a Sabellian, and otherwise unworthy of the pastoral office: after which he was banished. The time of his death is not certain: some think, he did not die before the year 360. Sozomen says, he had been assured, that ^d Eustathius bore the hard treatment he met with very patiently.

5. Eustathius is placed by Jerom, in his letter to Magnus, among those Christian writers who were remarkable for secular learning, as well as for their knowledge of the scriptures: but Socrates reckons him among those obscure persons, who ^e had endeavoured to raise their own reputation by opposing Origen. Sozomen, however, commends ^f him for his elo-

^a Eustathius, genere Pamphilius, Sidetes, primum Berhææ, Syriæ, deinde Antiochiæ rexit ecclesiam. Et adversum Arianorum dogma componens multa sub Constantino principe pulsus est in exilium Trajanopolim, Thraciarum, ubi usque hodie conditus est. Exstant ejus volumina de Anima, de Engastrymutho adversum Origenem, & infinite epistolæ, quas enumerare longum est. De V. l. c. 85.

^b Vid. Cav. Hist.

^c Hist. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 166. &c.

Tillemont Mem. Ec. T. vii. Pagi Crit. in Baron. Ann. 324. n. 26. &c. 325. n. 17. 327. n. 3. 340. n. 19. ^c Vid. Socr. l. i. c. 24. Soz. l. ii. c. 19. Thdr. l. i. c. 21. ^d Soz. l. ii. c. 19. fin.

^e Socr. l. vi. c. 13.

^f Ἀνὴρ τὰ τε ἀλλὰ καλὸς καὶ ἀσάβητος, καὶ ἐπὶ ευχαρίσθῃ δικαίως θαυμάζομενος, ὡς ἐκ τῶν φερομένων αὐτῷ λόγων συνιδὼν εἴη. — Soz. l. ii. c. 19. fin.

quence, as well as piety; and says, that his works were in his time well esteemed. Theodoret calls him^a the great Eustathius.

6. I need not give a particular account of Eustathius's works: the inquisitive may find sufficient satisfaction in the writers before referred to. The fragments collected by^b Fabricius deserve to be read.

7. Eustathius's enmity to Arianism^c is well known: whether he was not a Sabellian is doubtful.

8. Eusebius of Cæsarea accused him^d of Sabellianism soon after the council of Nice. Socrates's expressions in his account of the sentence passed upon Eustathius by the synod at Antioch are remarkable: 'That^e he was deposed, as rather adhering to the doctrine of Sabellius, than of the council of Nice.' And he presently afterwards owns, that George of Laodicea, in his history of Eusebius of Emesa, relates, that Eustathius was deposed, Cyrus of Bercea accusing him as a Sabellian. The fragments collected by Fabricius may be thought to countenance this supposition: and there are learned moderns, who^f think, that Eustathius of Antioch was of the same opinion with Marcellus of Ancyra, and that neither of them were orthodox.

C H A P. LXXV.

ATHANASIUS, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA.

- I. *His history.* II. *Select passages.* III. *His testimony to the scriptures, in his Festal Epistle.* IV. *In his other works:* 1. *To the Gospels.* 2. *The Acts.* 3. *Paul's Epistles.* 4. *Catholic Epistles.* 5. *The Revelation.* V. *Of the doctrine of the apostles, and the Shepherd of Hermas.* VI. *Various readings.* VII. *A Bible sent by Athanasius to the emperor Constantine.* VIII. *General titles and divisions, and respect for the scriptures.* IX. *The sum of his testimony.* X. *The Synopsis of sacred Scripture.*

^a —της αληθείας προμαχος ο μελλας Ευσταθιος. Theod. l. i. c. 21. p. 52. A.

^b Bib. Gr. T. 8. p. 172. &c.

^c Eustathium nostrum, qui primus Antiochenæ ecclesiæ episcopus contra Arium clarissima tuba bellicum cecinit. Hieron. ad Evang. T. ii. p. 571. in. Vid. & Theod. l. i. c. 8. in.

^d Διαβάλλει δι' ευσεβίου ως την Σαβελλιανότητα. Socr. l. i. c. 23. f. Conf. Soz. l. ii. c. 18.

^e Καταίρειν Ευσταθιον ως τα Σαβελλιαν

μαλλον φρονεοντα, η απαρ η εν οικαια συνodus ιδουματισιν. Socr. l. i. c. 24. in.

^f Pour Marcel, le fait passe à present constant. Il fut Sabellien. A l'égard d'Eustathe, des Savans le defendent, d'autres l'accusent. Pour moi, je ne croi pas, qu'on puisse l'excuser. Beausobre Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 543, not. (2.) Vid. ib. p. 542. et Worm. Histor. Sabellianismi, cap. 5. n. 19, 20.

I. ATHANASIUS succeeded Alexander in the see of Alexandria in the year 326, and died in the year 373, when he had been bishop 46 years^a complete.

There is no need that I should write the history of Athanasius, or give a particular account of his works: the nature of my design allows me now to contract, since the life of Eusebius of Cæsarea; nor shall I transcribe Jerom's chapter^b from his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, because it is not very important. I have referred to divers learned moderns, who have bestowed laudable pains in writing at large the history of this celebrated bishop; and the reader may also consult the Testimonies or Elogies of ancient writers, prefixed to the Benedictine edition of his works. As I do not there see the name of Epiphanius, I insert here his character of Athanasius; that^c he was the father of orthodoxy.

II. Though I do not write the life of Athanasius, I may be allowed to transcribe some remarkable passages.

1. On^d account of the doctrine of the Trinity, he says, the heathen people of his time thought, that the Christians taught a plurality of Gods.

2. Athanasius's enmity to Arianism is well known: I formerly cited^e a passage where he speaks of it as the worst of all heresies. He elsewhere says, the^f devil was the father of it: nor will he by any means allow, that^g Arians can be rightfully called Christians.

3. When he declaims against Arianism, as^h the worst and most hateful of all heresies, he makes this its peculiarity, that whilst other heretics endeavoured to support their opinions by sophistry, these^k men have invented a new way, and have endeavoured to carry their point by external, that is, civil authority, or the power of the magistrate. 'Whenever^l any man differs from them, they have him before the governor, or the general: whom^m they cannot subdue by reason and argu-

^a Vid. Pagi Ann. 326. n. 3. 372. n. 9, 10, 11. Basnag. Ann. 373. n. 9. Cav. H.

L. Athanas. Vit. a Benediclin. adornat.

Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. viii. ^b De V.

I. cap. 87. ^c — Αθανάσιον τὴν μα-

καριον, καὶ παῖρος τῆς ορθοδοξίας. H. 69.

n. 2. p. 728. B. ^d Ελληνων—

φασκοῦντων καὶ νομιζομένων, διὰ τὴν τριάδα,

λέγειν καὶ ἡμᾶς πολλὰς θείας. Or. iii.

Contr. Arian. n. 15. p. 564. C.

^e Vol. iii. p. 390. ^f — ὡς ὁ

παῖς αὐτῆς ὁ διαβόλος. Contr. Arian. Or.

h. n. 1. p. 405. C. ^g ΑΛΛΑ καὶ οἱ

τέλει καλῶντες χριστιανούς, πολὺ καὶ λίαν πλανῶνται. Ib. p. 406. A. ^h Ἡ δὲ

νῆα καὶ μυστὰ τῶν αἱρετικῶν.— Hist.

Arian. ad Monach. n. 67. p. 384. B.

^k Οἱ δὲ προφάσει ταύτης ὁρῶντες αὐτῶν

λοιποὺς ἀσχημονήσας, καὶ μὴδὲν εὐλογοῦν

ἐχούσας, ἀλλὰ ὁδὸν ἐπισησάν, καὶ διὰ τῆς

ἐξουθὺν ἐκείνης ἐκδικεῖν ταύτην ἐπιχειροῦσαν.

Ib. n. 66. p. 383. D. E. ^l Καὶ μόνον

τὴν αὐτοῖς ἀνίστηναι, ἐλκεῖται πρὸς τοὺς ἡσι-

μοῖα, ἢ τοὺς γράμματα. Ib. p. 384. B.

^m — λοιποὺς ὡς μὴ διδυνῆναι πείσασθαι

λοῖσι, τῶν τε βίῃ, καὶ πλεονεξίᾳ, καὶ

ῥ ment,

'ment, they take upon them to convince by whippings and
'imprisonments; which is enough to shew, that their princi-
'ples is any thing rather than religion: for it is the property
'of religion not to compel, but to persuade. Our Lord him-
'self does not use violence, but leaveth men to the freedom
'of their own choice. Speaking to all, he says: *If any*
'*man will come after me: and to the disciples: Will ye also go*
'*away?*'

And on account of these violent methods in particular, he
says, that ^a this sect, or heresy, had put on the devil-complete.

4. Athanasius observes, that ^a Christian people never took
their denomination from their own bishops, but from the Lord,
in whom we believe. And though the blessed apostles are our
masters, and have ministered to us the gospel of our Lord, we
are not named from them. For from Christ we are, and are
called Christians. But they who receive from others a new
faith, are justly denominatèd from them, whose property they
are.

III. I proceed to his testimony to the scriptures: and here I
begin with transcribing at large the fragment, which we have,
of ^r what is called a Festal, or Paschal Epistle.

'But ^a since we have spoken of heretics as dead persons,
'and of ourselves as having the divine scriptures for salvation:
'and I fear, lest, as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, some few
'of the weaker sort should be seduced from their simplicity
'and purity by the cunning and craftiness of some men, and
'at length be induced to make use of other books called apo-
'cryphal, being deceived ^t by the similitude of their names,
'resembling the true books: I therefore intreat you to bear
'with me, if I by writing remind you of things which you
'know already, as what may be of use for the church. And
'for the vindication of my attempt, I adopt the form of the
'evangelist Luke, who himself says: Forasmuch as some have
'taken in hand to set forth writings called apocryphal, and to
'join them with the divinely inspired scriptures of which we

διδασκαλῆσις ελκεῖν ἐπιχειρεῖ, γνωρίζουσα
αὐτὴν καὶ βίως, ὡς πάντα μάλλον εἶναι, ἢ
θρονοῦ. Θεοσεβείας μὲν γὰρ ἰδίον, μὴ
ἀναστρέφειν, ἀλλὰ πειθεῖν, ὡς περ ἱπταίμεν.
α. λ. Ib. n. 67. p. 384. C. ^a Matt.
xvi. 24. ^o John vi. 67. p. Ω

καὶ τῆς αἰρετικῆς, οὐκ ἐνδυσσάμενης τὸν δια-
βολὸν ἐν αἰσθήσει καὶ πράξει. Ib. n. 66. in.
p. 383. C. ^q Οὐδε πωπὸς γὰρ λαὸς
ἐκ τῶν εἰρησίων ἐπισκοπῶν ἀσχέτην ἐπαινε-
μαίαν, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς κίτης, εἰς ἣν καὶ τῆς

πρὶν εἶχοντο—ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ χρί-
στοι καὶ ἵσμεν, καὶ ὀνομαζόμεθα. Οἱ δὲ
περὶ αἱρέων ἐχούσης τῆς ἀρχῆς ἢ ὀμνύου-
σι πρὸς, καὶ τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν καὶ τὸν ἀπο-
στολὴν, ὡς αὐτὸν γέγονε κλημά. Cont.
Arian. Or. i. n. 2. p. 406. C.

^r Ejsufdem, ex trigesima nona epistola
festali, initio mutila. T. i. p. 961. D.

^s Ibid. p. 961. E. 962, 963. A. B.

^t —ἀπαλιμμένοι τοῦ ὀμνύματος τὰς ἀλη-
θινὰς βιβλίας. p. 961. E.

are fully assured, as they delivered them to the fathers, who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word: it has seemed good to me also, with the advice of some true brethren, and having learned it from the beginning, to set forth in order these canonical books, which have been delivered down to us, and believed to be divine scripture: that every one who has been deceived, may condemn those who have deceived him: and that he who remains uncorrupted, may have the satisfaction to be reminded of what he is persuaded of. The books of the Old Testament, then, are all of them in number two and twenty: for so many are the letters of the Hebrew alphabet said to be. The names and order of each one are thus: The first Genesis, the next Exodus, then Leviticus, after that the Numbers, and then Deuteronomy. After that is Joshua the son of Nun, and the Judges, and after that Ruth. And again, the next in order are the four books of the kingdoms: of these the first and second are reckoned one book; and in like manner the third and fourth are one book. After them, the first and second of the Remains [or Chronicles] are in like manner accounted one book. Then the first and second of Esdras, also reckoned one book. After them the book of the Psalms, then the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs. Beside these there is Job, and at length the Prophets. The twelve are reckoned one book. Then Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and with him Baruch, the Lamentations, the Epistle. And after them Ezekiel and Daniel. Thus far of the books of the Old Testament. Nor do I think it too much pains to declare those of the New. They are these: The four gospels, according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, according to John. Then after them the Acts of the apostles, and the seven epistles of the apostles called catholic: Of James one, of Peter two, of John three, and after them of Jude one. Beside these there are the fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, the order of which is thus: The first to the Romans, then two to the Corinthians, after them that to the Galatians, the next to the Ephesians, then to the Philippians, to the Colossians, after them two to the Thessalonians, and the epistle to the Hebrews, then two to Timothy, to Titus one, the last to Philemon: and again, the Revelation of John.

¹ — και μαθηται ανωθεν, εξης εκθεσθαι τα κειντα βιβλια, και παραδοθειν, πινεν-
τα τε βιβλια και βιβλια. p. 962. A.

επιστολαι καθολικαι καλημεναι των αποστο-
λων επτα. Ib. C. ² Προς τρεις Παυλος

³ Μικα ταυτα, γραφεις αποστολων, και

Ib. D.

These

‘ These ² are fountains of salvation, that he who thirsts may
 ‘ be satisfied with the oracles contained in them: in these alone
 ‘ the doctrine of religion is taught: let no man add to them,
 ‘ or take any thing from them. Of these our Lord spake,
 ‘ when he put the Sadducees to shame, saying: *Ye² do err,*
 ‘ *not knowing the scriptures.* And he exhorted the Jews: *Search*
 ‘ *the scriptures: for these are they which testify of me.* How-
 ‘ ever, for the sake of greater accuracy, I add as follows:
 ‘ that^c there are other books beside these, without: not ca-
 ‘ nonical indeed, but ordained by the fathers to be read to
 ‘ [or by] those who are newly come over to us, and are de-
 ‘ sirous to be instructed in the doctrine of religion. The
 ‘ Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther,
 ‘ Judith, Tobias: the Doctrine of the Apostles, as it is called,
 ‘ and the Shepherd. So that my^d beloved, those being ca-
 ‘ nonical, and these read, there is no mention of apocryphal
 ‘ books: but they are the invention of heretics, who wrote
 ‘ them after their own pleasure: assigning^e to them, and add-
 ‘ ing to them, times; that producing them as ancient writ-
 ‘ ings, they may take occasion to deceive the simple.’

Upon this enumeration, or catalogue of the books of the holy scripture, we may make a few remarks: and many are not necessary.

1. Here is mention made of these sorts of books only: ‘ ca-
 ‘ nonical,’ such as are ‘ read’ or allowed to be read, and ‘ apo-
 ‘ chryphal:’ by which last the writer of this epistle means
 books of heretics, to which they affixed a high value. Athanasius here takes no notice of ‘ contradicted’ books, so distinctly spoken of by Eusebius of Cæsarea.

2. The reader sees, what books of the Old Testament are reckoned by this writer canonical: and how many others besides are mentioned by him, as ‘ out of the canon,’ yet allowed to be read. And I would add here, with regard to the other works of Athanasius in general, that there the Wisdom of Solomon is often quoted, Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, but seldom; and the books of Maccabees scarce at all; which last, as we see, are also quite omitted in this catalogue,

² Ταῦτα πηλαί τε σωτηρίῳ, ὡς τοὶ διψ-
 ὄντα τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις διδασκαλῶν. Ἐν
 ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδασκαλῶν
 εὐαγγελίζονται. Μηδὲς ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.
 — κ. λ. Ib. D. ^a Matt. xxii. 29.

^b John v. 39. ^c Ὡς οἱ ἐγὼ καὶ ἑτέρα
 βιβλία τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἢ κανονισμένα μὲν
 εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀναγι-
 νώσκονται τοῖς ἀπὸ προσερχομένοις. — B.
 963. A. ^d — κακῶν κακῶν
 ζομένων, καὶ τῶν ἀναγιγνωσκόμενων. Ibid.
^e — χαρίζομένων δὲ καὶ προσερχομένων
 αὐτοῖς χρόνους· ὡς παλαιὰ προφητεία
 προφασίᾳ ἔχουσι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας
 αὐτοῖς. Ib. B.

3. This may suffice for that part of the catalogue. Upon the latter part, concerning the scriptures of the New Testament, I think it incumbent on me to be more particular: and therefore I proceed as follows.

IV. The Festal Epistle, just transcribed, is generally allowed to be 'genuine; but as some may not reckon it to be certainly so, and as such catalogues are liable to alteration, and possibly some things may have been inserted by later transcribers, to make it more agreeable to the sentiments of their own times; it will be best, for fuller satisfaction, to observe the quotations of scripture in other works of Athanasius.

1. The four gospels, as we have sufficiently seen, were always received by all catholic Christians in general: it is, therefore, quite needless to refer to any of the numerous quotations of them in the works of this writer.

We may however observe, that^e he gives John the evangelist the title of 'the divine.' He gives likewise the same title to all the apostles in general, calling them^h 'our Saviour's 'divines.'

2. The Acts of the apostles too were generally received: nevertheless I shall refer to one or two of the many passages of Athanasius, where this book is largely quoted by him.

'Letⁱ them hear the great and blessed apostles in the Acts.' After which he quotes some of the discourses of Peter and Paul there recorded. He quotes this book as^k written by St. Luke. Again, according^l to the divine Acts of the apostles.

3. The Festal Epistle expressly mentions fourteen epistles of Paul. Thirteen were universally received. The^m epistle to the Hebrews is often quoted by Athanasius as the apostle Paul's.

4. We proceed to the catholic epistles.

1.) The epistle of James isⁿ quoted, as written by an apostle, as^o written by James.

ⁱ Epistola Festalis, initio mutila, ut cuique palam est, ex numero esse videtur epistolarum Athanasio Festalium ab Hieronymo memoratarum lib. de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, in qua tamen nonnulla forte occurrat adversa suspicio. — Verum nostro quidem iudicio, nihil est, ut ea de causa hæteamus. Benedictin. Monitum. T. i. p. 938.

^k ἡ φησι καὶ ὁ θεολόγος αὐτῆς. Εὐαγγ. πρὸς τὸν ὁ λόγος. — Cont. Gent. n. 42. T. i. p. 41. C. D. ^h Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ παρὰ τὴν αὐτὴν τὴν σωτηρίαν θεολογῶν ἀνδρῶν πιστεῖναι τις δύναται ἐνὶ συγχάνειν τοῖς ἐκείνων γράμμασι. De Incarn. n. 10. p. 55. D.

ⁱ Ἀκούετε καὶ τῶν μεγάλων καὶ μακαρίων ἀποστόλων ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι. κ. λ. De Sent. Dionys. n. 7. p. 247. D.

^k Πᾶσι μὲν οὕτως ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν — ὡς ἐγράψεν ὁ Λευκάς, πιστοῖναι τε καὶ ἰδιδάξαι. Ep. Encyl. n. 1. p. 270. B.

^l — καὶ αὐτὰς θείας τῶν ἀποστόλων πράξεις. Ad Amun. n. i. p. 959. C. ^m Οὐ μὲν γὰρ μακάριος Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους φησι. De Decret. Nic. Syn. n. 18. p. 223. E. Et passim. ⁿ Καὶ ποιήτης, ὁ ἀποστόλος φησι νομῶν. De Sent. Dionys. n. 20. p. 257. E. Vid. Jac. iv. 11.

^o Οὐκ ἐστὶν δὲ πᾶρα τῷ θεῷ, ὡς αὐτῶν ὁ λακωνικός.

2.) The

- 2.) The first epistle of ^a Peter is frequently quoted.
- 3.) Words of the second epistle of ^a Peter are several times quoted: and sometimes expressly as ^a Peter's.
- 4.) The first epistle of ^a John is oftentimes quoted, and sometimes very distinctly.
- 5.) The second epistle of John is quoted ^a very distinctly. I have no particular reference to the third epistle.
- 6.) Athanasius has ^a twice the words of Jude, ver. 6.
5. The book of the Revelation is several ^a times, and largely, quoted by Athanasius.

6. Upon the whole, then, we perceive, from the other genuine and unquestioned writings of Athanasius, as well as from the Festal Epistle, that this famous bishop of Alexandria, in the fourth century, received the same books in the New Testament as canonical which we do.

V. Besides these books the Festal Epistle mentions two others, the 'Doctrine of the Apostles,' and the 'Shepherd of ^a Hermas:' and they are both so mentioned, as to shew plainly, that they were not a part of the rule of faith, or books by which doctrines may be proved. They are said to be 'without,' and 'not canonical;' that is, out of the canon.

1. Of the former I have already ^a spoken sufficiently, and shall add nothing farther.

2. Of the Shepherd of Hermas too we have ^a distinctly observed the value set upon it by former writers: all that remains is to consider, what notice Athanasius takes of this book in his other works.

3. In one place it is quoted as ^a a very useful book. He quotes it again in another place, which ^b I refer to in the margin. In another place he quotes a passage of it, which ^c he supposeth the Eusebians had an eye to. Once more, he quotes

παράλλαξ, η τροπης αποσκευασμα. Ep. 1. ad Serap. n. 26. p. 674. D. Vid. Jac. i. 17. ^a Καὶ Πέτρος ἐβράβη· καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦ τέλους τῆς πίστεως. [1 Pet. i. 9.] Epist. i. ad. Serap. p. 653. E. ^a Vid. Hist. Arian. ad Monach. n. 29. p. 360. D. E. Vid. & Ep. ad Amun. p. 960. A. ^b Οὐ γὰρ οὐ Πέτρος, ἵνα γεννηθῇ ὁμοῦς κοινῶν φύσεως. Or. i. contr. Arian. n. 16. p. 420. E. 2 Pet. i. 4. Conf. Ep. i. ad Serap. n. 23. p. 672. C. & ad Adelp. n. 4. p. 944. A. ^c Δεδοίκεν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐπιστολῇ λέγων ὅτι· ὁ πρὸς ἀρχῆς. Or. iv. contr. Arian. n. 26. p. 637. C. D. ὡς ἐβράβη ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης. κ. λ. Adv. Arian. Orat. i. in. p. 405. A. ^d Καὶ μὴ καὶ χαίρει

τοῖς τοιούτοις λέγει, ἵνα μὴ ὥστε καὶ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν κοινῶν γίνωμεθα, ὡς παρεγγράφει ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης. Ep. Enc. ad Ep. Aeg. n. 6. p. 400. C. ^e Ep. i. ad Serap. n. 26. p. 675. A. Ep. 2. ad Serap. n. 3. p. 685. A. ^f Καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει. κ. λ. Or. i. contr. Arian. n. 11. p. 415. D. Vid. & Orat. ii. contr. Ar. n. 23. p. 491. B. C. & Or. iv. contr. Ar. n. 28. p. 639. & Ep. ii. ad Serap. n. 2. p. 684. ^g See p. 259—261. ^h Διὰ δὲ τῆς ὑπερμελείας βίβλου τῆς ποιμενικῆς. De Incarn. n. 3. p. 49. D. ⁱ De Decret. Nic. Syn. n. 4. p. 411. D. ^j Εδοξέθη δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ συνήκῃ γὰρ φησὶ. Ad. Afr. n. 5. p. 895. B.

it upon account of an argument of the Arians from the same passage before referred to. 'But' it is written in the Shepherd: (since they allege that book too, though it is not in the canon :) First of all, believe, that there is one God.— Having answered their argument, he adds: 'And' why do they blame those who think rightly, for using unscriptural phrases, when they make use of unscriptural phrases to support impiety.'

4. Nothing can be plainer, than that the Shepherd of Her- mas was not a book of authority with Athanasius.

VI. I shall take notice of but very few various readings in the works of this writer.

1. The Benedictines in their edition put our author's cita- tion of Acts xx. 28. according to ' the common reading, Feed the church of God. But they acknowledge in^e a marginal note, that some manuscripts have Lord, others Christ.

2. Athanasius has a very uncommon reading at Rev. xxii. 14. which^h I place at the bottom of the page, with aⁱ remark.

VII. About the year^k 340, Athanasius sent a copy of the Bible to the emperor Constant. He speaks of it in a letter to Constantius, whom he assures, 'that he had written to his brother but once before, and then again upon^l occasion of sending to him the books, or volumes of the divine scrip- tures, which by his order he had prepared for him.'

Learned men have been divided about the meaning of the original phrase; but Montfaucon, I think, has^m clearly shewn, that thereby we are to understand the scriptures in several vo- lumes. As a confirmation of this sense, I transcribeⁿ a part of

^h Εἰ δὲ τῶν ποιμένων γράμματα· ἐπειδὴ καὶ ταῖς καλοῖσι μὴ οὐκ ἐκ τῆς κατοικίας, προφεροῦσι. De Decret. Nic. Syn. n. 18. p. 223. F.

ⁱ Διὰ τοῖν αἰσχυρῶς αὐτοὶ λαβεῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐφευρόντες, αἰκωλίας τῆς αἰσχυρῶς λαβεῖς ἐνυστεύουσιν; lb. p. 224. A. B.

^k Vid. Ep. i. ad Serap. n. 6. p. 653. D.

^l Reg. i. κυρίως. At sequer. & Felckm. Χρίστου.

^m Μακάριοι οἱ ἐκλυττοὶ τῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ. κ. λ. Or. iv. contr. Arian. n. 28. p. 639. C.

ⁿ Upon that pecu- liar reading^o my excellent friend Dr. Ben- son has given me this observation: 'He is ready to think, that ἐκλυττοὶς was either written by way of contraction, or blindly, so as scarce to be read at all: and that some bold or blundering transferber changed it into ἐκλυττοὶς. Thus the reading will agree with that ancient read- ing, mentioned by Mill, and supported

^o by MSS. Versions and Fathers.'

^p Vid. Benedictin. Vit. S. Athan. p. 33.

^q Καὶ δὲ συνῆλα τῶν θεῶν γραφῶν κλει- σαῖος αὐτῶν μοι καλίσκευσαι, ταῦτα ποι- ησας ἀπεστάλα. Ad Imp. Constanti. Apol. n. 4. p. 297. D. E. — συνῆλα quippe illa τῶν θεῶν γραφῶν nihil esse aliud arbi- tramur, quàm ipsam sacram scripturam, quæ ad faciliorem legentis usum, in plura volumina compingeretur: συνῆλα quippe significant volumina. Monitum in Synopsi. Scripturæ ap. Ath. T. ii. p. 124.

^r Est itaque συνῆλος liber compactus, sive volumen. — Innumera proferre licet similia loca, quæ palam fiat συνῆλα τῶν θεῶν γραφῶν nihil aliud esse, quàm libros scripturarum sacrarum plura in volumina compactos, non vero synopsis sacræ scrip- turæ: quem admodum συνῆλος ἀπολλινάρης est liber Apollinarii, & συνῆλος ἀριστίνδους Qi-

his argument at the bottom of the page. Mill * concurs with that learned Benedictine.

VIII. The Festal Epistle represents distinctly the several parts of scripture, and the great respect shewn them by the author. Nevertheless, some forms of quotation, and evidences of like respect, may be also taken from the other works of Athanasius.

1. In the Festal Epistle are expressions of the highest regard for those books, which were canonical, or the rule of faith; whether of the Old or the New Testament. They are divine scriptures, oracles, fountains of salvation; in them alone the doctrine of religion is taught with absolute certainty, without any danger of being deceived and misled.

2. Quoting Paul, he calls him, the^p blessed Paul, a man bearing or carrying Christ; and the holy servant of Christ.

3. The sacred^r and divinely inspired scriptures are sufficient to shew us the truth.

4. Censuring the multitude of Arian synods, he says, 'The^r divine^r scripture is sufficient above all: but if upon this^r occasion a synod be needful, let them observe the determinations of the fathers at the council of Nice.'

5. 'Let^r these be hearkened to, the determination of the^r gospel, the preaching of the apostles, the testimonies of the^r prophets.'

6. Having quoted several passages out of the Old Testament, 'But^r do you also,' says he, 'search the gospels, and what the apostles have written.'

7. 'Let^r us inquire after the ancient tradition, and doctrine, and faith of the catholic church, which the Lord delivered, which the apostles preached, which the fathers kept: for on this the church is founded.'

λοκαλίας est liber Philocalis Origenis. Animadv. xv. in Vit. & Script. Athan. ap. Coll. Nov. Patr. p. 38, 39.

o — five Biblia integra, pluribus in lectoris commodum voluminibus compacta. Mill. Proleg. n. 745.

P — eis εν ο χρησφορος ανηρ ο μαρκιου Παυλος. Contr. Gent. n. 5. p. 5. F.

— λεοσιος τε χρησφορος ανδρος. De Incarn. n. 10. p. 56. A.

q O ασιος τε Χριστ διακονος Παυλος. Contr. Gent. n. 26. p. 25. A.

r Αισαρκης μιν γαρ εισιν αι ασιαι και διοπνευσι γραφαι προς την της αληθεας απαγγελιαν. Contr. Gent. n. 1. T. i. p. 1. B.

* Εστι μιν γαρ ικανωτερα παρ' αυτη η θεια γραφη. Ει δε και συνοδου χρεια

πρι τειν, ει τα τον παλιον και τον γαρ εκ ημιλησαι οι εν κλησια, συνιδουσι. De Synod. n. 6. p. 780. B.

* Πρηνεσθω τοις — και της ημιλησαι πρις ο λοφος, και ευαγγελιον ο ορος, και των αποτλων το κρησμα, και των προφητων η μαρτυρια. — Contr. Apoll. l. ii. n. 4. p. 949. C.

u Ερωτασι δε και υμεις πρι τον ηνωτα γελισις, και εν ισραηλ οι αποστολοι. — Ep. i. ad Serap. n. 6. p. 653. A.

x Ιδωμιν δε και — αυτη τον εξ αρχης παραδοσιν και διδασκαλιαν και πρις της καθολικης εκκλησιας, η ο μιν κυριος ιδωται, οι δε αποστολοι εκηρυξαν, και οι παλιος εφ' λαξαν* εν ταυτη γαρ η εκκλησια τιμιωτα ασαι. Ep. i. ad Serap. n. 28. p. 676. D.

IX. This testimony of Athanasius to the scriptures is very valuable: it appears from the Festal Epistle, and from his other works, that he received all the books of the New Testament that we do, and no other, as of authority. And, considering the time in which he lived, the acquaintance he had with the several parts of the Christian church at that time, and the bishops of it, in Egypt, and its neighbourhood, in Europe, and Asia, and the knowledge he had of ancient Christian writings; it must be reckoned of great use to satisfy us, that notwithstanding the frequent quotations of other books, in the writings of divers ancient Christians, they did always make a distinction, and did not design to allege as of authority, and a part of the rule of faith, any books, but those which were in the highest sense sacred and divine.

X. It yet remains, that we take notice of ^y the Synopsis of Sacred Scripture, usually joined with the works of Athanasius. By some it has been reckoned genuine; but for the most part, it is supposed by learned men ^z to be falsely ascribed to him. On this side of the question, the late learned ^a editors of Athanasius's works have freely declared themselves; and certainly they must be good judges. One reason of their rejecting it is, that it is not mentioned by any ancient writer, as a work of our Athanasius: which must be reckoned an argument of no small weight, considering how large a work it is. Some ascribe it to another Athanasius, who flourished near the end of the fifth century. Mr. Wetstein ^b expresseth himself very positively: Mill is ^c inclined to the same opinion, without being certain; which I think is best, as there is no very clear evidence who is the author.

1. In this Synopsis, in the first place, is a list or catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, with their several names, and the first sentence of each book. After that follow particular contents, or an abridgment of every book.

2. It seems to me, that there is some reason to suspect this to be a patched work; not all written by the same author, or

^y Synopsis Scripturæ Sacræ. Ap. Ath. T. ii. p. 126—204.

^z Nam Synopsis ista non est Athanasii. Petav. Dogm. Th. T. ii. p. 28.

— ab hodiernis criticis unanimi fere consensu Athanasio abjudicata. Cav. H. L.

See Tillem. sur S. Athanasie note 45. Mem. Ec. T. viii. & sur S. Lucian note 1. m. note 2. f. T. 5.

^a Primo namque a nemine antiquorum memoratur opus simile ab Athanasio ador-

natum. At certe vix potuit ab Hieronymo, aliisque patribus, iis maxime qui scripturas explanarunt, & a Photio ipso, tam insignis opus Athanasianum prætermitti. In Synopf. Monit. p. 124, 125. Vid. & Montfauc. Prælim. ad Nov. Coll. PP. T. ii. p. 38, 39.

^b Athanasius scripsit Synopsin sacræ scripturæ, operibus S. Athanasii episcopi insertam. Proleg. ad N. T. edit. accurat.

^c Vid. Mill. Proleg. n. 993, 994.

at the same time : for after the names of the canonical books of the Old Testament, those not in the canon are said ^a to be the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, Esther, Judith, and Tobit. But after having given the contents of the books of each Testament, he mentions ^a four books of Maccabees, and other writings, as contradicted, or apocryphal : but if one and the same person had been the author of the whole, why did he not mention these at first in the proper place ? I omit some other things, that might be mentioned in favour of the same supposition.

3. This Synopsis has a great agreement with the Festal Epistle : the canonical and uncanonical books of the Old Testament, (in the first instance, as before observed), are much the same in both. And the canonical books of the New Testament are mentioned in the same order.

4. Mill thinks, it ^a may be inferred from this Synopsis, that, at this time by the Christians of Alexandria the whole New Testament was divided into eight books : the first four were the four gospels, each being reckoned a distinct book ; the fifth was the Acts, the sixth the seven catholic epistles, the seventh the fourteen epistles of Paul, the eighth the Revelation.

5. To be now a little more particular, for the sake of those who may expect it.

1.) The author begins his Synopsis, saying, ‘ All ^a the ^a scripture of us Christians is divinely inspired ; and it contains not an indefinite, but rather a determined number of ^a canonical books : those of the Old Testament are these.’ Having mentioned their names, and put down the first sentence in each book, he says : ‘ The ^b canonical books of the ^a Old Testament all together, are 22, according to the number of the Hebrew letters : but beside these, there are other ^a books of the same Old Testament, not canonical, but read ^a only [and that especially] by, or to, catechumens.’ The books here mentioned are the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit. But presently after he adds, ‘ Some ^a say, that Esther is reckoned ^a canonical by the Hebrews, as also Ruth, being joined with ^a the book of the Judges. But Esther is a distinct book.

^a p. 128, 129.

^c p. 201. D. E.

^f Prolegm. n. 993.

^g Πασα γραφη των χριστιανων διοικνουτος εστιν εκ αοριστα δι, αλλα μαλλον ορισμενα και κικανονισμενα εχει τα βιβλια. Και εστι της μη παλαιας διαθηκης ταυτα. Synopf. p. 126. A.

^h Ομα τα κανονιζομενα της παλαιας δια-

θηκης, βιβλια οικουσι δυο, ισταριθμα της γραμμασι των εβραιων. — Εκτος δε τωτων εστι παλιον ετερα βιβλια της αυτης διαθηκης, η κανονιζομενα μη, αναγνωσκόμενα δι μη των τοις κληρικουσι ταυτα. Ib. p. 128. D. E.

ⁱ p. 129. A.

‘ However, in this way likewise they compute the full number of canonical books to be two and twenty.’

2.) ‘ These* then are the canonical, and the uncanonical books of the Old Testament.’

3.) Then he proceeds: ‘ The† determined and canonical books of the New Testament are these:’ where he mentions all the books of the New Testament in the same order as in the Festal Epistle, with the first sentence in each book. ‘ The last‡ is the Revelation of John the Divine, which has been received with the rest by the ancient holy fathers having the Spirit.’

4.) After which he gives somewhat largely the contents of the twenty-two canonical books of the Old Testament, ending with Daniel, from p. 131 to p. 168. Then he says, ‘ but it is proper to observe the others also, which are not canonical, but only read.’ Here he abridges Esther, Judith, Tobit, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach; from p. 168, to p. 177.

5.) Then he proceeds to the New Testament, and gives particularly the contents of each book, from p. 177 to 201. The first book with him is the gospel according to Matthew, the second book the gospel according to Mark, the third according to Luke, the fourth according to John: ‘ the fifth book is the Acts of the apostles, written,’ he says, ‘ by Luke, who travelled with other apostles, but more especially with Paul, and wrote what he knew with certainty.’ The sixth book contains the seven catholic epistles, written by several; the seventh book contains Paul’s fourteen epistles; the eighth is the Revelation, seen by John the evangelist and divine in Patmos.

6.) After which he adds: ‘ There are also divers other books, both of the Old and the New Testament, some contradicted, others apocryphal. The contradicted books of the Old Testament, spoken of before, are the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, and Esther, and Judith, and Tobit: with which also are reckoned four

* Καὶ τὰ μὲν τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία, τὰ τε κανονιζόμενα καὶ μὴ κανονιζόμενα. p. 129. B.

† Τα δὲ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης παλιν ὠρισμένα τε καὶ κανονιζόμενα βιβλία ταῦτα. p. 129. B.

‡ Ἐστὶ τῶν ἐν καὶ ἀποκαλυφτῇ Ἰωάννη τοῦ θεολογῆ, διχθεῖσα ὡς ἐκεῖνη, καὶ ἐκτετατα ὑπο παλαιᾶς αἰῶν καὶ πνευμαλοφορῶν ἐστὶν. p. 131. A.

ομοίως καὶ περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τῆς παλαιᾶς βιβλῶν, τῶν μὴ κανονιζομένων μὲν, ἀναβιβασκομένων δὲ, ὡς προειρηγμένα. p. 168. C.

ο Οὗ δὲ διηγήματος ταύτας ἐν Ἀθήκας οὐ ἀγελιστῆς, οὐ καὶ τὸ τοῦ βιβλίου συγγραφεὺς συλαπιδηται γὰρ τοῖς ἀλλοῖς ἀποστολῶν, καὶ μαλιστα τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ εὐδὼς ἀκριβῶς γράφει. p. 187. A.

p. 200. A.

q p. 201, 202.

' books of the Maccabees, the history of the Ptolemies, the
 ' Psalms and the Ode of Solomon, and Susanna: these are the
 ' contradicted books of the Old Testament. The apocryphal
 ' books of the Old Testament are these; Enoch, the Patriarchs,
 ' the Prayer of Joseph, the Testament of Moses, the Assump-
 ' tion of Moses, Abraham, Eldad, and Modad, and the pseu-
 ' depigraphal books of Elias the Prophet, Zephaniah the Pro-
 ' phet, Zachariah the father of John, Baruch, Ambacum,
 ' Ezekiel, and Daniel. The contradicted [or apocryphal]
 ' of the New Testament are these, The Travels [or Circuits]
 ' of Peter, the Travels of John, the Travels of Thomas, the
 ' Gospel according to Thomas, the Doctrine of the Apostles,
 ' the Clementines, out of which those things have been select-
 ' ed, which are true and divinely inspired. And these are read.
 ' All' these are thus set down for the instruction of men; but
 ' they are perversely written, and spurious, and to be rejected,
 ' And none of these are to be received with the rest, or reck-
 ' oned useful, especially the apocryphal books of the New
 ' Testament: in particular, no other writings, called gospels,
 ' are to be received, beside those four which have been de-
 ' livered to us; even the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke,
 ' and John.'

After all this is added * a brief account of the several Greek versions of the Old Testament, as that of the Seventy, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and some other, which were later.

All these things are referred to the reader's consideration. It is very fit to observe, in what class the Doctrine of the Apostles is placed by this writer, and with what books it is numbered. I have spoken of it distinctly in the chapter of * Eusebius. The Clementines likewise have been already described † sufficiently.

7.) In this work, particularly in the abridgment of the books of the New Testament, are several observations, which will not be approved by all. The author says, the † epistle to the Galatians was written by Paul at Rome; that ‡ to the Ephesians likewise at Rome, before the apostle was personally acquainted with those Christians. The same is said more than once by † Euthalius, contemporary with that Athanasius, whom some suppose author of the Synopsis. This author likewise, as

† Ταῦτα πάντα ἐξέλιθον μιν, ὅσον πρὸς
 εἰδέναι παραβέβηκεν διὰ τοῦτο, καὶ
 ἔτι, καὶ ἀποδύνα. Καὶ εἰδὲν τῶν, τῶν
 ἀποκρυφῶν μαλιστα, ἐκρίνον, ἢ ἐπωφελεῖς,
 ἐξαιρέτως τῆς νῆας διαθήκης—ταῦτα τε ἀλλὰ,
 καὶ ἄλλα κληθέντα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐναγλιδια,

ἐκὸς τῶν παραδοθειῶν ἡμῶν τεσσάρων τῶν.
κ. λ. p. 202. B.

* p. 259—261.

354—356. 359, 360.

x lb. F.

Vet. p. 524. 633, 634.

* p. 203, 204.

† See Vol. ii. p.

‡ p. 194. D.

γ Vid. Zacagn. Monum.

many others do, says, that * St. Peter's epistles were written to Jewish Christians.

8.) I add here some other things, which are in the latter part of this Synopsis. It is there said, ' that * Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew, and published it at Jerusalem; and that it was translated [into Greek] by James the Lord's brother according to the flesh, who was ordained by the holy apostles the first bishop of Jerusalem: that the gospel according to Mark was dictated by Peter at Rome, and published by the blessed apostle Mark, and preached by him in Alexandria and Egypt, and Pentapolis, and Libya: that the gospel of Luke was dictated by the apostle Paul, and written and published by the blessed apostle and physician Luke: as also in like manner the apostle Peter dictated the Acts of the apostles, but Luke the evangelist wrote them: that the gospel according to John was dictated by the holy and beloved apostle John, when he was an exile in the island Patmos, and was published by him at Ephesus, under the care of Gaius his host, and of the other apostles.'

But why were not these things mentioned before? They might have been as well taken notice of at the beginning of the abridgments of the several books here spoken of. Moreover, some things here said seem contrary to what was before observed: every one must perceive, that what is here said of the Acts of the Apostles, is quite different from what was said at the beginning of the contents or abridgment of that book.

9.) Here likewise, I mean in the latter part of this Synopsis, are the symbols of the four evangelists. Matthew's gospel is supposed to be signified by the face of a man, Mark's by that of a calf, Luke's by that of a lion, and John's by that of an eagle.

10.) Thus I have now given a large account of this Synopsis, much fuller than at first I intended. It is a long and laboured work, for which the author is intitled to commendation, though there are in it some inaccuracies. This Synopsis might be compared with the Stichometry of Nicephorus, published by several, and with the observations of Euthalius

* p. 188. F.

* p. 202.

— Ωςπερ και τας πραξεις των
αποστολων επιλεγειν μεν Πιτρος ο αποστολος,
συνταξας δε ο αυλος Αγκας. lb. p. 202.
Ε. * Το δε καλα Ιωαννης ευαγγελιον
συνταξας τε υπ' αυτου τε αλφιν Ιωαννης τε
συνταξας και πληρημενη, εως εξοριση εν

Παλμω τη νησω, και υπο τη εξιδοθη εν Ε-
φειση, δια Γαιου τε αλφιν και ξενοδοχου
των αποστολων, περι η και Παυλος Ρωμα-
ις γραψαν φησι. Ασπαζισαι εμας. κ. λ.
Ibid. p. 202. F. d p. 202. C.

* Vid. Coteler. ap. Patr. Apost. &
Montfauc. Bib. Coislin. p. 204.

upon the books of the New Testament, of which I shall speak more distinctly hereafter.

11.) Upon the whole, I think, this writer, whoever he is, probably of Alexandria, or near it, received no books of the Old Testament, as of authority, beside those of the Jewish canon. And for the New Testament, he received all those which we now receive, and no other.

12. Finally, it deserves our particular notice, that this writer, as well as other ancient Christian writers in general, professeth the highest respect for the books of sacred scripture. For having put down the catalogue of the canonical and uncanonical books of the Old Testament, and then the canonical books of the New, he adds: ‘So^s many, even these, are the canonical books of the New Testament, and as it were the first-fruits of our faith, or anchors and fastenings: having been written and published by the apostles of Christ, who conversed with him, and were taught by him. But innumerable other books have been since composed by great, and wise, and holy men, by way of testimony to them, and for explaining and illustrating them, of which I need not now speak particularly.’

C H A P. LXXVI.

A DIALOGUE AGAINST THE MARCIONITES.

1. I THINK it not best to overlook intirely a book, intitled, Of the right Faith in God, or a Dialogue against the Marcionites, in five parts or sections, ascribed to Adamantius, by some supposed to be the same as Origen. I formerly took some notice of it in the general account of^a Origen’s works, and may have occasion to quote it often hereafter in the history of the heretics of the two first centuries. It is fit therefore, that we should observe briefly the author’s testimony to the books of the New Testament. But he is not the famous Ori-

^s Ap. Zacagn. Monum. Vet. p. 401. &c.

^s Ὅσαυτα καὶ τὰ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης βιβλία, τὰ γε κανονιζόμενα, καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν οἶοναι ἀκροθίνια, ἢ ἀσχυραὶ καὶ ἐρείσ- μαλα· ὡς παρ’ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων τῇ Χριστῷ, τῶν καὶ συγγενομένων ἐκείνῳ, καὶ ἐκ’ αὐτῆς μαθήτευσάντων, γραφέντα καὶ ἐκ-

τεθέντα· ἐπεισέσει ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλήσιαν ἀκρο- λυθίαν καὶ συμφωνίαν, ἀλλὰ μόνον καὶ ἀναριθμήτα βιβλία ἐξεπονήθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ καιρὸς μισθῶν καὶ σοφιστῶν θεοφό- ρων πάλιν, εἰς μαρτυρίαν τῶν προλαβόντων καὶ διαφάσεων. κ. λ. p. 131. A. B.

^a See Vol. ii. p. 455.

gen. It appears manifest, from expressions in the first section of the work, that ^b it was written in the time of a Christian emperor. And from the confession made near the beginning of the same ^c section by Adamantius the orthodox disputant, it is probable, that it was not composed until after the council of Nice: accordingly, it is the general opinion of learned men, that ^d the author of this Dialogue is different from Origen, and that it may be placed about the year 330.

2. The author owns ^e four gospels, and no more, written by John, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, disciples of Christ.

3. He calls them all disciples of Christ: for he says, that ^f Mark and Luke were of the number of the seventy or seventy-two disciples.

4. Though ^g there are four evangelists, he says, there is but one gospel.

5. Adamantius, the orthodox disputant, receives also ^h the Acts of the Apostles.

6. In this work the four gospels are often quoted, and most of St. Paul's epistles, particularly the ⁱ epistle to the Ephesians, by that title, and the epistle to ^k the Hebrews.

7. The second epistle of Peter is here ^l quoted.

8. The words of 2 Pet. ii. 19. *Of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage*, are quoted by ^m Adamantius, not as the words of Peter, but as a saying or maxim of some wise man, not a Christian,

^b Vid. Dialog. p. 30. Basil. 1674. p. 816. Bened.

^c p. 3. Basil. p. 804. Bened.

^d Vid. Huet. Origenian. l.

iii. Sect. 1. n. v. & in App. n. ix. Tillem.

Origine. Art. 36. et note 13. Mem. T.

iii. & Benedictinor.. Monitum ap. Origen.

Opp. T. i. p. 800. Beaufob. Hist. Manich.

T. ii. p. 84, 85.

^e Οι μαθηται τε Χρησ γειραφικασιν, Ιωαννης και Ματθαιος,

και Μαρκος και Ληκας. Dialog. sect. i. p.

7. Basil. 806. B. Bened.

^f Πρωτης απιριλε ις και μελα ταυλα ος ευαγγελισασ-

θη Μακρος ην και Ληκας εκ των ος ολις Παυλω τω αποστολω ευαγγελισαυτο. Ib. p. 8.

Basil. 806. D. Bened.

^g Ευαγγελισται μετ ποσους, ευαγγελιον δε εν. Ib. p. 9.

Basil. 807. Bened.

^h Προφαρον ανα-

γισθηναι τας των αποστολων πραξεις, και

τας επιβολας. κ. λ. Ib. Sect. ii. p. 58.

Basil. 828. D. Bened.

ⁱ Εφιστοις δε επιτελλων φησι· Μνημονευοις, ολι ποτε

υμεις τα εθνη. κ. λ. [Eph. ii. 11, 12, 13.]

Sect. v. p. 148. Basil. 867. c. Bened. Εφισ-

τοις δε επιτελλων ο αποστολος φησιν. Ib. p.

152. Basil. 869. A. Ben.

^k — καλα τον αποστολον. Ο γαρ νομος σκια των μελ-

λων αναν. [Heb. x. 1.] Sect. iv. p. 114.

Basil. 853. A. Ben. Ο μη επιρηθ σαρκι, ο

δε ελυσθη, και οι λοιποι εν φονη μαχαίρας

απθανον. Sect. iv. p. 125. Basil. 857.

Ben.

^l Πη δε υπο Πειρη τε αποστολη γισραμμενος καλα την σοφιαν, φησιν, την

διδδομενην τω αδελφω μη Παυλω. Sect. ii. p.

58. Basil. 828. D. Bened. Vid. 2 Pet. iii. 15.

^m Πεισθη δε σε και ο εξωθεν λοφος· ολι

εκατος η ητηται, τεινω και διδουσαι. Sect.

i. p. 41. Basil. 821. A. Bened.

C H A P. LXXVII.

J U V E N C U S.

1. As Jerom has an article ^a for Juvenius in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, I shall transcribe it at the bottom of the page. His name at length was C. Vettius Aquilinus Juvenius: he was a native of Spain, and a man of a good family. Jerom mentions a work in four books containing the history of our Lord, as recorded in the four gospels, and another work: the former is still extant. Jerom says, he lived in the time of Constantine: which also appears from the conclusion of the fore-mentioned poem. Juvenius is in ^b Trithemius: who takes particular notice of the two works, mentioned by Jerom; and supposeth, that Juvenius had written others, though he had not seen them.

2. Jerom seems to have been much pleased with Juvenius; for he has made honourable mention of him in his letter to ^c Magnus, and placed him in his ^d Chronicle, and quoted him in his Commentary upon ^e St. Matthew. That quotation relates to the presents made by the wise men to our Saviour at his nativity, and the design of them; and may deserve to be compared with the verses of Sedulius ^f, another Latin poet, in the fifth century, upon the same subject.

3. Juvenius is, certainly, a good witness to our four gospels, and the things contained in them; but I do not think it needful to make many extracts. I only observe, that Juvenius seems to understand Matt. xxviii. 17. as if the evangelist said, some ^g

^a Juvenius, nobilissimi generis, Hispanus, presbyter, quatuor Evangelia hexametris versibus pene ad verbum transferens, quatuor libros composuit, & nonnulla eodem metro ad sacramentorum ordinem pertinentia. Floruit sub Constantino Principe. De V. I. cap. 84.

^b De Script. Ecc. c. 68. ^c Juvenius presbyter sub Constantino historiam Domini Salvatoris versibus explicavit: nec pertimuit, Evangelii majestatem sub metri leges mittere. Ad Magn. ep. 83. T. iv. p. 657. ^d Juvenius presbyter, natione Hispanus, Evangelia heroicis versibus explicat. Chr. p. 181.

^e Pulcherrime munerum sacramenta Juvenius presbyter uno versiculo comprehendit: *Thus, aurum, myrrham, regique, lacrimaeque, Deoque Dona ferunt* Ad Matt. cap. ii. p. 9. Conf. Juvenii Historiam

Evangelii p. 57. F. ap Bib. Patr. Max. T. iv.

^f Aurea nascenti fuderunt munera Regi.
Thura dedere Deo, myrrham tribuere sepulchro.

C. Sedulii Carm. Pasch. l. ii. p. 30. ver. 95, 96. edit. Cellar. 1704.

^g Jamque Galilaeos conscenderat anxii montes

Mandatis Christi concursans turba suorum.

Cernitur ecce suis proles veneranda tonantis.

Illum procumbens sancte chorus omnis adorat.

Nec tamen in cunctis pariter fundata manebat

Pectoribus virtus: nam pars dubitabat eorum.

Juven. Hist. Ev. l. iv. lb. p. 77. B.

of Christ's disciples *still doubted*; but ^b Grotius, and some ¹ others, think, he means only, that *some had doubted before*, but were now all satisfied. Theophylact ² well deserves to be consulted upon this text.

C H A P. LXXVIII.

JULIUS FIRMICUS MATERNUS.

1. JULIUS FIRMICUS MATERNUS, not mentioned by Jerom, or any other ancient writers that we know of, wrote a book against heathenism, still extant, inscribed to the emperors Constantius and Constans. Cave says very well, that ^a his book of the Error of profane Religions was written some time between the years 340 and 350; I therefore place him at the year 345. Julius was ^a a convert from heathenism; but it does not appear, that he had any ecclesiastical character. It is more probable, that he was a layman, and a person of quality.

2. He speaks ^c of the power which Christians had over dæmons, or the heathen deities.

3. He speaks of the great progress which the Christian religion had made, as ^d obtaining in every part of the world, and superior to Gentilism in many places.

4. He applauds the emperors ^e for having destroyed the heathen temples, and ascribes their success in war to that conduct.

^b Vid. Grot. ad Matt. xxviii. 17.

¹ See Dr. Benson's Reasonableness of the Christian Religion, p. 53, 54.

² In Evangelia, p. 183.

^a De tempore, quo scriptus sit hic liber, nihil certi statui potest: nisi quod intra annum 340, post mortem Constantini junioris, & annum 350, quo interfectus est Constans, scriptus sit. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 204. Et Conf. Pagi in Baron. An. 337. n. 12. & Binsag. Ann. 350. n. 9.

^b At ego nunc lacrarum lectionum institutione formatos, perditos homines religioso sermone convenio. De Error. Profan. Religio- num. Cap. 7. p. 168. E. ap. Bib. PP. Max. T. iv. & p. 424. ex edit. Jacob. Gronov. Lugd. Batav. 1709.

^c Sic apud nos deos vestros, cum hominibus nosse ceperint, religiosi sermonis flagella rati- gant. Sic in corpore hominum consti- tuti dii vestri verbo Dei spiritualium flam-

marum igne torquentur, & qui apud vos quasi dii coluntur, apud nos religiosæ fidei medela Christi gratia humano subjacentes imperio, & tormenta repugnantes sustinent, & victi pœnis ulticibus subjugantur. Cap. 14. p. 170. B. Bib. p. 433. Gr.

^d Quis locus in terra est, quem non Christi possederit nomen? qua sol oritur, qua occidit, qua erigitur septentrio, qua vergit auster, totum venerandi numinis majestas implevit. Et licet adhuc in quibusdam regionibus idololatriæ morientia palpitent membra, tamen in eo res est, ut e Christianis omnibus terris pestiferum hoc malum funditus amputetur. Cap. 21. p. 172. H. Bib. PP. 445. Gron.

Modicum tantum superest, ut legibus vestris prostratus Diabolus jaceat, ut extinctæ idololatriæ pereat funesta contagio. Cap. 21. p. 173. A. Bib. p. 446. Gr.

^e Post excidia templorum in majus Dei

5. In divers parts of his book he earnestly excites the emperors to restrain the ^f idolatrous rites of heathenism by their edicts, to demolish their temples, deprive ^a them of their ornaments. For this he makes use of many arguments from the Old ^b and the New Testament: but I cannot say, that I admire his temper, or perceive the solidity of his reasonings, upon this occasion.

6. I proceed to his testimony to the scriptures, which is very considerable; but it ought not to be expected, that I should be very particular in so late a writer.

7. He speaks ¹ of the Old and the New Testament.

8. He has quoted most books of the Old Testament, and many of them by name.

9. He has many references to the four gospels.

10. He quotes the gospels of ^k Luke, and ^l John by name, and many passages from this last.

11. He received ^m the book of the Revelation, which he quotes often, and largely, and with great respect.

12. He shews great ⁿ respect for the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament in general,

essis virtute proveſſi. Vicissis hostes, propagasti imperium. &c. Cap. 29. p. 176. F. Bib. p. 463. Gronov.

^f Amputanda sunt hæc, sacratissimi Imperatores, penitus atque delenda, & severissimis edictorum vestrorum legibus corrigenda, ne diutius Romanum Orbem præsumptionis istius error funestus commaculet, ne pestiferæ consuetudinis convalescat improbitas. Cap. 17. Bib. PP. p. 171. A. Gronov. p. 437.

^g Tollite, tollite, securi, sacratissimi Imperatores, ornamenta templorum. Deos istos aut monetæ ignis, aut metallorum coquat flamma. Donaria universa ad utilitatem vestram, dominiumque transferte. Cap. 29. p. 176. F. Bib. p. 463. Gron.

^h Sed & vobis, sacratissimi Imperatores, ad vindicandum & puniendum hoc malum necessitas imperatur, & hoc vobis Dei summi lege præcipitur, ut severitas vestra idolatriæ facinus omnifariam persequatur.— In Deuteronomio [cap. xiii.] lex præscripta est. Cap. 30. p. 179. E. Bib. PP. 467. Gr.

ⁱ Lapis hic—Christus aut fidei fundamenta sustentat, aut in angulo positus, quorum parietum membra æquata modera-

tione conjungit, id est, veteris & novi Testamenti in usum colligit gentes. Cap. 21. p. 172. H. Bib. 446. Gr.

^k Invenimus enim in Evangelio Lucæ: *Sint lamini vestri præcincti.* &c. Cap. 20. p. 172. D. Bib. 443. Gr.

^l Dicit enim in Evangelio Joannis. Cap. 19. p. 171. H. Bib. p. 441. Gr.

^m Secretiora pandantur arcana. In Apocalypsi, quis sit sponsus, inveniemus. Cap. 20. p. 172. C. Bib. 443. Gr.

Hæc eadem nobis sancta revelatione monstrantur. Invenimus enim in Apocalypsi ita esse præscriptum. Cap. 25. p. 174. E. Bib. PP. p. 453. Gron.

ⁿ In hac probatione arcana Prophetarum veneranda pandantur. Adfistat nobis sanctorum oculorum fides. Joel divino Spiritu mone[n]te sic dicit. Cap. 20. p. 172. C. Bib. p. 442. Gron.

Ait enim de hoc Esaïas, inuente Spiritu Sancto. Cap. 21. p. 172. F. Bib. 444. Gr.

Hoc a venerando Propheta sancta voce præcanitur, & ex ore prophetico vox jubentis auditur. Ait enim Spiritus Sanctus, Cap. 25. p. 174. D. Bib. 452. Gr.

C H A P. LXXIX.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM.

I. *His time and works.* II. *A catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament.* III. *A general remark.* IV. *Observations relating to the gospels.* V. *Of the Acts of the apostles.* VI. *St. Paul's epistles.* VII. *The catholic epistles.* VIII. *The Revelation.* IX. *General divisions, and respect for the sacred scriptures.*

ST. JEROM has a short chapter concerning Cyril, which I put at the bottom of the^a page. I translate only what relates to his writings: 'His Catechetical discourses, which he composed in his youth, are still extant.'

It is computed, that^b Cyril was born about the year 315, that he was ordained presbyter in 344 or 345, bishop in 350 or 351, and died in 386. For farther particulars concerning his history, and his works, I refer to other^c authors. The Catechetical Discourses mentioned by Jerom, and which alone I shall have occasion to quote, were composed in 347 or 348, while he was yet presbyter only.

II. I begin with citing that discourse, which contains a^d catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament.

'These^e things, says he, we are taught by the divinely inspired scriptures of the Old and New Testament. For there is one God of both Testaments, who in the Old Testament foretold the Christ, who has been manifested in the New.—Read the divine scriptures, the two and twenty books of the Old Testament, which were translated by the seventy-two interpreters.—Read^f those two and twenty books, and have nothing to do with apocryphal writings. These, and these only do you carefully meditate upon, which we securely or openly read in the church. The apostles and ancient bishops,

^a Cyrillus Hierosolymæ episcopus, sæpe pulsus ecclesia, & receptus, ad extremum sub Theodosio Principe octo annis inconcussum episcopatum tenuit. Extant ejus κατηχησεις, quas in adolescentia composuit. De V. I. cap. 112.

^b Vid. Ant. Aug. Touttée Benedictin. Diff. i. De Vit. Cyril. Hieros. ^c Vid. Toutt. ut sup. Cyril. ex edit. Tho. Milles Oxon. Cav. Hist. Lit. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. viii.

^d Cat. iv. n. 33—36. Ed. Bened. n. 20—22. edit. Milles. ^e Ταῦτα δὲ διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς

αἱ θεοπνευστοὶ γραφαὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς τε καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης. Cat. iv. n. 33. in. Bened.

^f Τὼν τε ἀποστόλων τε καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν βιβλίων ἀναγιγνωσκί.

Πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἀποκρυφα μὲν οὐκ ἔχει κοινὸν ταύτας μονὰς μελέτα σπουδαίως, ἀλλ' ἐν καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ μέγα παρρησίας ἀναγιγνωσκόμε. Πολὺ οὖν φρονιμώτεροι, καὶ εὐλαβεστέροι ἦσαν οἱ ἀποστολικοὶ, καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἐπισκοπικοὶ, οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προαγαλῆς, οἱ ταύτας παραδόσεις, σὺ ὡς, τικτοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας οὐκ μὴ παραχαράττεις τῆς θεομύτης. κ. λ. Ib. c. 35.

' governors of the church, who have delivered these to us,
 ' were wiser and holier than thou. As a son of the church
 ' therefore, transgress not those bounds: meditate upon the
 ' books of the Old Testament, which, as has been already
 ' said, are two and twenty: and if you are desirous to learn,
 ' fix them in your memory, as I enumerate them one by one.
 ' Of the law the first are the five books of Moses: Genesis,
 ' Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. Then Jesus
 ' the son of Nun, and the book of the Judges, with Ruth,
 ' making the seventh. Then follow the historical books, the
 ' first and second of the kingdoms, which according to the
 ' Hebrews are one book: in like manner the third and fourth
 ' book. And the first and second of the Chronicles, also
 ' reckoned by them one book. The first and second of Esdras
 ' too are computed one book. The twelfth is Esther. These
 ' are the historical books. The books written in verse are
 ' five: Job, and the book of Psalms, and the Proverbs, and
 ' Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, the seventeenth book.
 ' After these are five prophetic books, the twelve prophets,
 ' being one book: of Isaiah one, of Jeremiah one, with Ba-
 ' ruch, and the Lamentations, and the Epistle: then Ezekiel,
 ' and the book of Daniel, the twenty-second book of the
 ' Old Testament.

' The ^ε books of the New Testament are the four gospels
 ' only; the rest are falsely inscribed, and hurtful. Receive
 ' likewise the Acts of the twelve apostles: as also the seven
 ' catholic epistles of James and Peter, John and Jude: and
 ' the seal of all, and the last [work] of the disciples, the
 ' fourteen epistles of Paul. As for any beside these, let them
 ' be all held (A) in the second, or no rank. And whatever
 ' books are not read in the churches, those neither do thou
 ' read in private, as thou hast heard.'

III. This is the catalogue of the sacred books of scripture,
 publicly read at that time in the church of Jerusalem, and
 the only books from whence doctrines were to be proved. I
 leave it to my readers to make several remarks which I omit:
 but it must hence appear evident to all, that no books written

ε Της δε καινης διαθηκης, τα τεσσαρα
 μονα ευαγγελια* τα δε λοιπα ψευδοεπιγραφα
 και βλαβερα τυγχανει—Διχου δε και τας
 πραξεις των δωδεκα αποστολων* προς τειλους
 δε και τας επ'α Ιακωβου, και Πιπρι, Ιωαννου,
 και Ιουδα, καθολικας επιτολας* επισφρα-
 γισμα δε των παλαιων, και μαθητων το τελειν-
 ταιον, τας Παυλου δικαιοσυρας επιτολας.

Τα δε λοιπα παλαια εξω κεισθω εν διωλεγγ.
 Και οσα μιν εν εκκλησιας μη αναγνωσκει-
 ται, ταυτα μηδε καλα σκευη αναγνωσις,
 καθως ηνεκας. Ib. n. 36. p. 69.

(A) Reliqua vero omnia extra in secundo
 [ac nullo] ordine habentur. Versio Be-
 nedictina.

after

after the times of the apostles, or by any men who were not either apostles, or companions of apostles, were esteemed by the church of Jerusalem a part of the New Testament, or of the rule of faith.

IV. I now add some other observations concerning the latter part of the Catalogue, and the gospels in particular.

1. One thing observable is the order in which the books of the New Testament are placed: the gospels, the Acts of the apostles, the catholic epistles, and the epistles of St. Paul. In like manner in another place: 'There^b yet remain many other texts, that might be alleged from the Acts of the apostles, the catholic epistles, and the fourteen epistles of Paul.'

2. Cyril says, that^c St. Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew.

3. He had in his copies the^d first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel.

4. He says, that^e John the Baptist connected the Old and New Testament.

5. Moreover he was of opinion, that^f baptism had its original from the same John.

6. There was no doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer in Cyril's copies. The prayer in him concludes after this manner: *And^g lead us not into temptation, O Lord, but deliver us from evil. Amen.*

7. He quotes^h St. Mark's gospel expressly.

8. Quoting St. John's gospel, he gives him the title ofⁱ the divine.

V. The book of the Acts of the apostles^j is often and largely quoted by Cyril in his Catechetical Discourses, and as divine scripture.

He is very clear, that^k the epistle of the council of Jerusalem, recorded in Acts xv. was sent to all Gentile Christians in general.

^b Αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν πολλὰ δι' αὐτῆς τῆς πρῆτης ἀποστολῆς—λεῖπται δὲ πολλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῶν καθολικῶν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν Παύλου δι' ἐπιστολῶν. Cat. 17. n. 20. p. 271.

^c Ματθαῖος ὁ γραφῶν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἑβραϊδὶ γλώσσῃ τέλει ἔγραψε. Cat. 14. p. 212. D.

^d Ἐὰν τοῖνυν ἀκούσῃς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, λιβάντος. Βιβλος γινώσκεις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαβὶδ. Cat. 11. n. 5. in.

^e Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, ὁ μέγας μὲν ἐν προφήταις, ἀρχηγὸς δὲ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, καὶ τρεῖς τινὰ συναπλῶν ἀμφότερας. Cat. 10. n. 19. p. 146. B.

^f Παλαίαις τοῖς καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης ἀρχὴ τὸ βαπτισ-

μα. Ἰωάννης γὰρ ἡ ἀρχὴ. Cat. 3. n. 6.

^g Vid. Cat. 23. cap. 17, 18.

^h Ὁ γὰρ ἐν τρίτῃ ὥρᾳ σταυρωθεὶς, ὡς Μάρκος φησὶ. Cat. 17. n. 19. ⁱ Οἱ τῶν αἰῶν εὐαγγελίων ἀκροῦται Ἰωάννη τῷ θεολογῶν πιστωμένοι. Cat. 12. c. 1. in.

^j Καὶ μοι λαβὼν τῶν λόγων ἀποδείξιν ἀπὸ τῆς θείας γραφῆς· Κορινθίος ἦν αὐτῇ δίκαιος—Cat. 3. n. iv. p. 41. C. Σίμων, ὁ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων.—Cat. 6. n. 14. in.

^k Καὶ γραφῶσιν οἱ ἀποστολῆς καὶ πρεσβύτεροι πᾶσι τοῖς ἐθνέσιν καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ. Cat. 4. cap. 28. Vid. & Cat. 17. n. xxix.

VI. Cyril, as we have seen, received fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul: he mentions * that number of Paul's epistles several times.

VII. St. James's epistle, in his enumeration, is the first of the twelve catholic epistles. If by the author of that epistle he meant the brother of our Lord, and the first bishop of Jerusalem, he did not reckon him to be an apostle, as appears by several * places. Touttée particularly acknowledges as much in a * note.

VIII. The book of the Revelation seems not to have been received by Cyril, or the church of Jerusalem, in his time. It is not mentioned in the catalogue above transcribed: it may be supposed to be there excluded by him, and ranked among apocryphal scriptures, not expressly named. And there is another passage which countenanceth that supposition: for, speaking of Antichrist, he quotes * Daniel, the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew, the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians: but declines all notice of the Revelation, and perhaps reflects upon it as * apocryphal. I therefore transcribe below a note * of the Benedictine editor upon this place.

IX. 1. I put down an instance of general divisions, where at once are mentioned * Old and New Testament, law and

* Τιθαυμακα αληθως της τε αϊου πνευματος οικονομιας* πως τας μεν των αλλων επιστολας εις ολιγας περιεγραψεν αριθμοι* Παυλου δε των πολλων διωκτη γραφαι δικαιοσυσασα επιστολας ιχαρισματο. Cat. 10. n. 18.

Επιλειπει γαρ με διηγεμενος ο χρονος, εις εϋδομην λειπειν τα λοιποντα περι αϊου πνευματος εκ τε Παυλου τισσαρες και δικα επιστολων. Cat. 17. n. 34. Vid. ibid. n. 20.

† — εις δωδεκα μαρτυρας. Ει τοις δωδεκα απιστοι, της πενητακοσις διχισθωσαν. Επιστα ωφθη Ιακωβω τω ταυτην μεν αδελφω επισκοπω δε πρωτω της παροικιας ταυτης. Cat. 14. n. 21. p. 216. A.

— αλλ' ηδη και τοις αποστολοις, και Ιακωβω τω ταυτης της εκκλησιας επισκοπω σπυδο γεγενε. Cat. 4. n. 28. p. 66. A.

n Notandum, sive in hoc loco, in quo sancti Jacobi auctoritatem & dignitatem maxime extollit Cyrillus, sive Cat. 4. n. 28. solum illi episcopalem dignitatem tribui, nusquam apostolicam. Imo cum utrobique ab Apostolis fecernere videtur. Touttée, not. 1. p. 216.

15. n. 12, 13, & seq. * Vid. Cat. 15. n. 12, 13, & seq. † Βασιλευσει δε ο ανιχριστος τρια και ημισιν αιωνι μοια.

Ουκ εχ' αποκρυφον λεγομεν, αλλ' εκ τε Δανιηλ. Φησι γαρ* Και δοθησιναι η χρις αυτη εις καιρον, και καιρων, και ημισιν καιρον. Cat. 15. n. 16. p. 232. Vid. Dan. vii. 25. Et conf. Apocal. xii. 14.

‡ Visum est nonnullis Apocalypsim hic a Cyrillo notari. Quod ratione non caret. Eam sane in apocryphorum nomine habuit, qui cum libros quos in canone non comprehendit apocryphorum nomine compellit. Cat. 4. num. 33. Apocalypsim præmittit in recensione librorum Novi Testamenti, ibid. n. 36. Præterea veteres omnes, quos in hac Catechesi sequitur, res Antichristi exponentes semper Apocalypsim Danieli conjungunt. Vide Irenæum, Hippolytum — Non igitur imprudens Cyrillus, sed penitus certo consilio Apocalypsis in toto hoc argumento commemoracionem prætermisit, hujusque prætermissionis rationem hoc loco allegare videtur. Toutt. not. 2. p. 232.

§ — δι ουχ ημεν μεν ο νομος και προφηταις, εμεις δε ο ευαγγελισμοις και αποστολοις αλλ' ο ος και το αυλο πνευμα αϊον, το ο παλαια και καινη διαθηκη τας διδας λαλουντας γραφαι. Cat. 17. n. 5. p. 267. A.

prophets, gospel and apostles: where likewise it is said, that all those scriptures were dictated by one and the same Spirit.

2. I add other passages, expressing the peculiar regard which was shewn to the same scriptures.

3. Why^b do you curiously inquire after what the Holy Spirit has not written in the scripture?

4. This^c we do not say of our own invention, but upon the ground of the scriptures received [or read] in the church.

5. He^d continually alleges the books of scripture in proof of what he teaches. He says, that^e not any the least article of faith ought to be proved by mere probable reason only, without the divine scriptures.

6. The creed, he says, is^f a summary of the principal doctrines of religion collected out of the scriptures.

7. He calls his hearers^g disciples of the New Testament.

8. He recommends it to his hearers, to^h nourish their souls, and establish themselves by reading the divine oracles.

9. He says, that^k they of them who are studious, may by frequent reading the divine scriptures, learn more fully what he delivered briefly only for want of more time.

C H A P. LXXX.

THE AUDIANS.

I. THEODORET placeth the Audians^a in the time of Valens, who began his reign in 364: but Tillemont^b thinks it best to follow Epiphanius, who indeed expressly says, that^c

^b Τι τοιούτων πολυπράγμων α μηδε το φησιν αβιον εβραϊσιν εν ταις γραφαις. Cat. 11. p. 12.

^c Ταυτα δε διδασκομεν, ως οριστολογητες, αλλ' εκ των θειων εκκλησιαστικων γραφων. Cat. 15. p. 13.

^d Και αλλας δε σπειρας μαρτυριας εχων εκ των θειων γραφων—ακριβοησομαι ταις προφητειαις. Cat. 15. p. 33.

Και μοι λαβε των λογων την αποδειξιν απο της θειας γραφης. Cat. 3. p. 4. p. 41. C.

^e Δει γαρ επι των θειων και αινω της πιστεως μυστηριων, μηδε το τυχον αιν των θειων παραδιδουσαι γραφων. Cat. 4. p. 17.

^f Ου γαρ ως εδοξεν ανθρωποις συντιθη τα της πιστεως, αλλ' εκ

πασης γραφης τα καιριωτατα συλλαχθεισα μια αναπληροι την της πιστεως διδασκαλιαν. Cat. 5. p. xii. p. 78.

^g Και της διαθηκης μαθηται. Cat. 1. p. 1.

^h Θρεψον σε την ψυχην αναγνωσις θειας. Cat. 1. p. 6. p. 19.

ⁱ Και παροικους την σιαυτη ψυχην ασφαλιζε ημερας, προσευχαις, — και θειων λογων αναβρωσμων. Cat. 4. p. 37. p. 70.

^k Των σπουδαιων εν υμιν εκ της συνεκδορας των θειων γραφων αναβρωσις ταυτα μαθηται. Cat. 17. p. 34.

^a Hist. Ec. l. iv. cap. 10.

^b Mem. Ec. T. vi. Les Audiens. p. 692.

^c Ουλος ο Αυδιος τελειω αρχη της γεννητας εν χρονους αρια. κ. λ. H. 70. p. 1.

Audius

Audius lived at the same time with Arius; and says also, that Uranius, who succeeded Audius, was^d dead when he wrote, about 376. I place Audius at about 350. If he was then dead, he^e still flourished in his followers, which were somewhat numerous.

2. Audius was^f a Syrian of Mesopotamia, much esteemed in his own country, as^g Epiphanius acknowledges, for holiness of life, and zeal for the faith: who^h seeing some things done in the churches, which he thought not to be right, reprov'd and admonish'd the bishops and presbyters to the face; telling them, that such things ought not to be. In particular, he reprov'd the rich clergy, and such of them as led a luxurious course of life. This brought upon him abundance of ill treatment, which he endured for some time, till at length he separated from the church. So Epiphanius. Theodoret's account is not veryⁱ different.

3. As his reproofs were offensive to the clergy, and many people began to follow him, the bishops^k accused him to the emperor, (whether Constantine, or one of his successors, is not certain:) who banish'd him into Scythia: where the good man lived for some time, and where he was useful. For^l he converted a good number of Goths to the Christian religion.

4. The Audians kept Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, after the manner of some other churches in the East. They said, that^m this was the ancient custom, confirmedⁿ by the Apostolical Constitutions, and that the bishops of Nice had innovated in complaisance to Constantine.

5. They are said by some to have been^o Anthropomorphites: and there are other things laid to their charge, which I do not think myself oblig'd to take particular notice of. Moreover

^d Ibid. n. 15.

^e Πολλοι δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνην τελευτὴν γέγονασι συναντοῖς τε καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν τῇ ταμίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐπισκοποῖ, οὐρανίος τις τῆς μέσης τῶν πωλαμῶν. κ. λ. Ibid. n. 15.

^f Αὐδαῖος Thdrt. ib.

^g Ἦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῆς μέσης τῶν πωλαμῶν οὐμαιμένος, διαφανὴς τις κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν πατρίδα, διὰ τὸ ἀκραίφνης τῷ βίῳ, καὶ κατὰ θεοῦ ζῆλον, καὶ πίστεως. Epiph. H. 70. n. 1.

^h Ὅς πολλὰ κίς δεικνύμενος τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις γενομένα, εἰς πρόσωπον ἐπισκοπῶν τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρων, ἐλεγκτικῶς ἀνελθεῖν, τοῖς τοιούτοις λέγων· ἢ χρὴ ταῦτα εἰς γένεσθαι, ἐκ οὐδεὶς ταῦτα εἰς παραστῆσθαι. Epiph. H. 70. n. 1.

ⁱ Φασκεῖ δὲ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀπισ-

χεῖσθαι συλλογῶν, ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῆς μὲν τοῦ ἐπαρλόντος ἐπισκοπῆς τοκοῦ, τῆς δὲ γυναικὸς ἢ ἰσχυρῆς γυναικὸς συνουσίᾳ παρὰ μὲν βίῳ. κ. λ. H. E. l. iv. cap. 10.

^k Epiph. ibid. n. 14. Et Conf. Theod. ubi supra.

^l — πολλὰς δὲ γὰρ καὶ κληρονομίας. Epiph. ibid.

^m Id. ib.

ⁿ n. ix.

^o n. x.

^o Vadianos, quos appellat Epiphanius, & schismaticos, non hæreticos vult videri, alii vocant Anthropomorphitas: quod rusticitati eorum tribuit Epiphanius, parcens eis, ne dicantur hæretici. Eos autem separasse se dicit, culpando episcopos divites, & pascha com Judæis celebrando. Augustin. Hæz. 1. Conf. Theodoret. H. E. l. iv. c. 10.

Epiphanius does again and again say, that^p they were orthodox upon the Trinity, and other points, and that they were only schismatics, not heretics.

6. Epiphanius does in one place say, that⁹ they made use of apocryphal books, and were fond of them: but he does not expressly mention the titles of any of them.

7. The Audians are not in Philaster: it is likely he had no knowledge of them.

8. A learned modern, well acquainted with ecclesiastical antiquity, speaks ^r honourably of Audius.

C H A P. LXXXI.

HILARY OF POICTIERS.

1. ACCORDING to Cave, Hilary of Poitiers flourished about the year 354. As Jerom has placed him among his illustrious men, I transcribe* below a part of his chapter: where are mentioned Hilary's Commentaries upon the Psalms, the gospel of Matthew, the book of Job, and the Canticles: where likewise the character of his writings may be seen in part.

2. In his ^b Prologue to the Commentaries on the Psalms is a catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, which I need only refer to.

3. Hilary appears to have received^c the epistle to the Hebrews, which was not universally received by the Latin Christians.

Ἔστι δὲ καὶ αὖτις παλαιὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐκδοχή,
ἐκ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Synopf. p. 808.

B. Vid. & H. 70. n. 1, 2. & Ancorat. n. 14. ἡ Κεχρηλας δὲ καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς, Synopf. p. 808. B.

Certe offensum eorum [episcoporum] vitiis, & intolerabili malitia magnum est tempore virum. Audiam, discessionem ab Ecclesia fecisse, multoque homines aliqui non malos propterea eum secutos esse, cum mores non ferrent eorum, quorum aliqui eorum non improabant. Balduin. De Legib. Constantin. l. i. cap. 6.

^b *Prolog. in. libr. Psalm. p. 9. Paris: 1693.*

^c Maxime cum scriptum sit: *Sunt enim efficientes Spiritus, in ministerium missi propter eos, qui hereditabunt salutem.* [Hebr. i. 14.]
In Pl. cxxix. n. 7. p. 440. A.

4. The book of the Revelation was generally received by the Latins: it is several times quoted by Hilary, and ^d as John's: whom he also supposeth to be ^e John the apostle.

5. I need not enlarge farther in the account of this writer.

C H A P. LXXXII.

A E R I U S.

1. AERIUS, ^a of Pontus, or Lesser Armenia, was ^b living when Epiphanius wrote in 376. He was a thorough ^c Arian: but the principles by which he was distinguished were such as these: He ^d denied the difference between a bishop and a presbyter, saying, they are one order, office, and dignity. He was likewise of opinion, that ^e no offerings ought to be made for the dead: forasmuch as such things tended to make men think that the practice of piety is not necessary; and that ^f if near the period of life, they could by presents or legacies, or some how or other, procure friends to pray for them after their death, they might escape the just punishment of their sins. They likewise denied the obligation of set fasts and feasts. The ^g keeping of Easter, they said, was unnecessary: for *Christ our passover had been sacrificed for us*, 1 Cor. v. 7. To

— *facturam autem per id quod Paulus ad Hebræos dixit. Tanto melior factus angelis, quanto excellentius ab his possidet nomen. Et rursum: Unde, fratres sancti, vocationis celestis participes, &c.* De Trinit. l. iv. p. 832. Vid. Hebr. i. 4. iii. 1. ^d Quod autem hæc folia ligni hujus non inutilia sint, sed salutaria gentibus, sanctus Johannes in Apocalypsi testatur. [Apoc. cap. xxii.] In Pl. i. p. 226. E.

^e — electus ex publicano Matthæus in Apostolum, & ex familiaritate Domini revelatione celestium mysteriorum dignus Johannes. De Trin. l. vi. n. 20. p. 891. D.

Vel ad sepulchrum prior quoque Petro currens adeptus es? vel intra confessus angelorum, & signatorum librorum insolubiles nexus — tam pia tibi hæc per Agnum ducem revelata doctrina est? Ibid. n. 43. p. 908. C.

^a Epiph. p. 905. B.

^b H. 75. n. 1. p. 905. A. Vid. et Synops. p. 809. B.

^c Τῇ μέν τῶν ἁγίων

αριανὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Synops. p. 809. Vid. & H. 75. n. 1. ^d Φασκεὶ δὲ μὴ εἶναι διαφορᾶν ἐπισκοπῶν πρεσβυτέρων. Synops. p. 809. — ^e μίαν γὰρ ἐστὶ ταξίν, καὶ μίαν, φησι, τιμὴν, καὶ ἑν ἀξίωμα. H. 75. n. 3. ^f Μὴ δύν, φησι, προσφύγειν ὑπὲρ τῶν προκειμένων. p. 809. B.

^g Τινὶ τῶ λόφῳ μέγα θάνατος ονομαζέσθαι, φησι, ονομαζέσθαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν; Εὐχέλαι γὰρ ὁ ζῶν, ἡ οἰκουμένη ποιεῖται, τὴν ἀφελῆσθαι οὐ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν; Εἰ δὲ οὗτος εὐχέλαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐκείνη, ἀρα γὰρ μὴδὲ ἐκκλησίαν μὴδὲ ἀσάθετον οὐκ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ κήσασθαι φίλους, δι' ἃ βελῆται τροπὴ, ἢ οὐ χρημασί τινας; οἱ φίλοι ἀξίως ἐν τῇ τιμῇ, καὶ ἐκχρισθῶσαν περὶ αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ τι ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ταῦτα ὑπ' αὐτῶν γίνονται τῶν ἀπικερτῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἐκζητῶν. H. 75. n. 3. p. 907. A. B.

^h Τὴν ἐστὶ τὸ πᾶσιν ὅτις ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; Ἰουδαίους παλαιοὺς μὲν προσηγορεύει. Οὐ γὰρ χριστὸς φησὶ τὸ πᾶσιν ἐκκλησίαν. κ. λ. lb. p. 907. A.

keep

keep Easter [or passover] now, was to give heed to Jewish fables, Tit. i. 14. and 1 Tim. i. 4. Set^a fasts too, they said, were Jewish ordinances. If I have a mind to fast, I will take the time that best suits me. Not but that they would sometimes fast on the fourth day of the week, as others do: however, they said, they did it not as bound thereto, but only of their free-will: which last particular is sufficient to shew, that what Epiphanius also says of their choosing to fast on the Lord's-day is a calumny, and an unrighteous aggravation of their principle.

2. These then were the sentiments of this people: this is the institution of Aërius and his followers. But how came they to differ so much from the rest of the world? from most of the Arians, as well as the Homoüfians? A necessary enquiry: forⁱ all heresy is supposed to spring from some evil root. Well, what was it? Let us attend. It is said, that Aërius was a friend of Eustathius, a man of Arian principles too: and that when Eustathius was made bishop of Sebaste in Lesser Armenia, about the year 355, Aërius was much^k concerned that he was not bishop likewise. Eustathius endeavoured to oblige him. He ordained Aërius presbyter, and appointed him governor of the hospital in the city: but Aërius was still uneasy, and therefore set up a new discipline: a story that does not seem to me to have the appearance of probability: nor are his principles so unreasonable, but that, without being under the bias of any prejudice, he might think them founded in scripture.

3. These people, as we learn from Epiphanius, met with great difficulties. Aërius^l and his followers were excluded from churches, and cities, and villages: and being obliged to wander abroad, they suffered great hardships, especially in the winter and cold weather.

^a Εἰ δὲ τις τῶν αὐτῆς βαλὼν ἡγενοῖτο, ὡς ἐν κίβητι τέλειται, φησι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Synops. p. 809. C.

Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἡγεσία, φησι, ἐπὶ τέλειται· ταῦτα γὰρ ἰδιαιτὰ ἐστὶ, καὶ ὑπο ζυγὸν δέχονται. — Εἰ γὰρ ὁμοῦς βεβαίως ἡγενοῖτο, οὐκ ὅτι αἰρετοῦμαι ἡμεῖς ἀπ' ἐμαυτῶν ἡγεῖν διὰ τῆς ἐλευθερίας. Οὐδὲν παρ' αὐτοῦ πεφύλακται μᾶλλον ἐν κυριακῇ ἡγεῖν, τῆς αὐτῆς δὲ, καὶ προσεβόησαν ἐσθίειν. Πόλλας δὲ καὶ τῆς τείρας ἡγενοῖτο, ὡς φησὶ, ἀλλ' ἰδίᾳ προαιρεσὶ φησι. H. 75. p. 3. p. 907. B. C.

ⁱ Πᾶσαι γὰρ αἱ κακοῦς τῶν γινόμενων ἀπ' ἀρχῆς

ἀρχὴ τῆς ἡγεσίας, ἡ ἐπαρσις, ταῦτα εἰργασάτο, ἡ ἐπιθυμία ὁρεῖς, ἡ ζήλος πρὸς τῆς πείρας, ἡ παροξυσμός, ἡ προπείρα. Epiph. H. 75. n. 1. p. 904, 905.

^k Αὐτὸς ὑπερὸν καθὲν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, τῶν ἐκδοχῶν αὐτῶν ἐμπιστεύει, ὡς ἐν τῇ πόλει καλεῖται πτωχόφρον. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 905. C.

Ἀπελευθέρω δὲ αὐτὸς μὲν τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ αἵρων, καὶ κώμων, καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν πλείων. Πόλλας δὲ μὲν πολλὰ ὅχλῳ τῶν ἰδίων ἐφομενοι, αἵρεσιν διελθόν, υπαίθροι τι, καὶ ὑπο πείρας αὐτίζοντο, ἐν ὑδαὶς καίαντες ὄντες. H. 75. n. 3. p. 906.

4. From ^m Augustine's manner of speaking we may be apt to think, that he knew of some such people at the time of writing his book of Heresies in the year 428. I have placed a large part of his article at the bottom of the page. They are also in ⁿ Philaster: but he does not seem to have been well informed concerning them: however, he says, there were then ^o many of them in Pamphylia.

5. Tillemont considers these people as ^p Calvinists. For certain, they went much upon the presbyterian plan: and they may induce us to think, that in most times there have been some who opposed growing superstition in the church, and asserted the freedom of the gospel: but being generally opposed, and with much violence, they could not increase to any great number, and in time they were reduced to nothing. We formerly saw another like instance ^q in the people of Neocæsarea, disciples of Gregory, generally called *Thaumaturgus*.

C H A P. LXXXIII.

THE COUNCIL OF LAODICEA.

I. *A Catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament.* II. *Remarks.*

I. THE 59th and 60th, or, according to another computation, the 58th and 59th, that is, the two last canons of the council of Laodicea in Lydia, or Phrygia Pacatiana, are to this ^a purpose.

‘That ^b private Psalms ought not to be read [or said] in the church, nor any books, not canonical, but only the canonical books of the Old and New Testament.’

‘The books of the Old Testament, which ought to be read, are these: 1. The ^c Genesis [generation] of the world. 2. The Exodus out of Egypt. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers.

^m Aëriani ab Aërio quodam sunt, qui cum esset Presbyter, doluisse fertur, quod episcopus non potuit ordinari: Et in Arianorum hæresin lapsus, propria quoque dogmata addidisse nonnulla, dicens, offerri pro dormientibus non oportere: nec statuta solemniter celebranda esse jejunia, sed, cum quisque voluerit, jejunandum, ne videatur esse sub lege. Dicebat etiam Presbyterum ab Episcopo nulla differentia debere discerni. August. Hæc. 53.

ⁿ H. 72.

^o — & in provincia Pamphylia quam plurimi commorantur. Ibid. ^p S. Basil. n. 39. Mem. T. ix. ^q See Vol. iii. p. 37. 39, 40. 53, 54. ^r Ap. Labbé Concil. T. ii. Bevereg. Cod. T. i.

^b Οτι ο δει ιδιωτικος ψαλμους λησεται η εκκλησια, ουδε ανακειντα βιβλια, αλλα μονα τα κανονικα της καινης και παλαιης διαθηκης. Can. 59. ^c Γενεσις κοσμου. Εξοδος εξ αιωνων.

‘Deutero-

Deuteronomy. 6. Joshua the son of Nun. 7. Judges, with Ruth. 8. Esther. 9. The first and second book of the Kingdoms. 10. The third and fourth book of the Kingdoms. 11. The first and second book of the Remains [or Chronicles.] 12. The first and second book of Esdras. 13. The book of 150 Psalms. 14. The Proverbs of Solomon. 15. The Ecclesiastes. 16. The Song of Songs. 17. Job. 18. The Twelve Prophets. 19. Isaiah. 20. Jeremiah and Baruch, the Lamentations and the Epistles. 21. Ezekiel. 22. Daniel. The books of the New Testament are these: the four gospels, according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, according to John: the Acts of the apostles: the seven catholic epistles: of James one, of Peter two, of John three, of Jude one, the fourteen epistles of Paul: to the Romans one, to the Corinthians two, to the Galatians one, to the Ephesians one, to the Philippians one, to the Colossians one, to the Thessalonians two, to the Hebrews one, to Timothy two, to Titus one, to Philemon one.

II. I shall now propose some observations upon this catalogue, and the council to which it is ascribed.

1. In this catalogue are omitted, for the Old Testament, the books of Judith, Tobit, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, the Maccabees: and in the New the Revelation; either not reckoning it a work of John the apostle and evangelist, or not esteeming it proper to be publicly read in the church.

2. The time of this council is not certain: some have placed it before the council of Nice; others^d between the council of Antioch held in 341, and the council of Constantinople in 381: some in 365, others in^e 363, which seems as likely as any.

3. Though the time of this council cannot be exactly settled; I think it cannot be denied, that there was a council held at Laodicea in the fourth century, which made many regulations concerning ecclesiastical discipline. This may be reckoned evident from the notice taken of it in the sixth general council at Constantinople, and other councils: and from its being particularly mentioned by^f Theodoret, who wrote within sixty or seventy years after the supposed time of it.

4. The chief design of that council appears to have been to deliver rules of church discipline. Nevertheless, the bishops

^d That was the opinion of Marca. See Tolkm. Mem. E. T. vi. Les Ariens Art. 199. & Pagi Ann. 314. n. 25.

^e Pagi ubi sup. Bafn. Ann. 363. n. 19.

^f Οὐ δὲ χάρις καὶ συνελθὼσα συνόδος ἐν λαοδικείᾳ τῆς φρυγίας ἡμεῖς κελεύουσι τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς προσερχέσθαι. Theod. in Coloss. cap. iii. 18. T. 3. p. 355.

there assembled may have been induced, for some reasons, to publish a catalogue of sacred books, to be publicly read in the churches. Accordingly, the last canon about scripture, is generally received as genuine, though it may not be quite so unquestioned as the other preceding canons. Some have observed, that this canon is omitted by Dionysius Exiguus, and that it is wanting^s in some ancient manuscripts. In answer to which I would say, that perhaps the omission by Dionysius^h may be accounted for: or it may be an accidental thing, of which no account can be easily given: and his omitting it, however it came to pass, may have been an occasion of its being wanting in some manuscripts.

5. Some are of opinion, that this council^k consisted of Arian bishops, and that it was conducted by Theodosius bishop of Philadelphia in Lydia, a man of the Arian party: though some^k dispute this, it may be reckoned no improbable supposition. Tillemont indeed imagines, that^l this is a disparagement of this council not to be admitted: and that it would be melancholy to think, that a council, the canons of which have been always received by the church, should have been only a council of men enemies of the faith, and separated from the catholic communion. But Pagi^m thinks this no just ground of offence.

6. This council has not been equallyⁿ esteemed by all. Possibly learned men, according to the different notions of the party they have been engaged in, have been led to disregard the last canon: some, because of its omitting the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, and others, because it has not the book of the Revelation. Basnage, in his history of the church, observes, that^o protestants and catholics have equally disparaged this synod.

^s 'I may add, that the canon of scripture, which we go by, groundeth much⁺ upon that enumeration subjoined to the last canon of the council of Laodicea, which yet is not found in the very ancient manuscripts. Gretser mentioneth one, and I meet with another here at home.' John Gregory's *Posthuma*, p. 85.

^h Daillé [*Use of the Fathers*, p. 45, 46. Lond. 1675.] endeavours to account for that omission of Dionysius.

^k Pagi *Ann.* 314. n. 25. ^k Basnage. *Hist. de l'Eglise*, liv. viii. c. 8. n. ii. p. 437.

^l Les Arians, Art. 139. ^m Nec mirum, Concilium ab hæreticis habitum Codicis canonum ecclesiæ universæ partem

facere, cum ab ecclesiâ receptum fuerit, & nihil ejus moribus contrarium contineat. Pagi *Ann.* 314. n. 25. ⁿ Concilii

Laodicensi canon ultimus, qui catalogum exhibit librorum scripturæ, apud Dionysium exiguum non invenitur. Et præterea, si vel admittatur, synodus tamen ipsa exigæ auctoritatis est, neque censeri potest vocem ecclesiæ Græcæ illius temporis exhibere; tum quod particularis tantum fuit quorundam in Lydia episcoporum, tum quod auctor canonum prædicatur fuisse quidam Theodosius — partibus Arianorum favens. Lampe *Proleg. in Joann.* l. 1. c. 7. n. 24. ^o As before, n. 3. p. 438.

7. Finally, it ought to be observed, that this was a particular council only, consisting of thirty or forty bishops of Lydia, and neighbouring countries. Indeed it is said, that the canons of this council were received and adopted by some general councils in after times. Nevertheless, perhaps it would be difficult to shew, that those general councils received the last canon, and exactly approved the catalogue of sacred books therein contained, without any addition or diminution, as we now have it.

8. I have thought it not improper to put down these several observations concerning this famous canon of the council of Laodicea, which are referred to the consideration of the candid and attentive reader.

C H A P. LXXXIV.

EPIPHANIUS BISHOP IN CYPRUS.

I. *His history.* II. *Three catalogues of the books of the Old Testament.* III. *A Catalogue of the books of the New Testament.* IV. *His testimony to the several books of the New Testament.* V. *General Titles and divisions, and respect for the scriptures.* VI. *Remarkable passages.* VII. *The sum of his testimony.*

I. ST. JEROM has a short chapter for^a Epiphanius, which I put in the margin without translating it.

He elsewhere speaks of Epiphanius with high^b commendations: and also says, that^c he was a man of five languages: that is, he understood Greek, Syriac, Hebrew, Egyptian, and Latin in part.

Epiphanius was a native of Palestine: he was chosen bishop of Constantia, formerly called Salamis, the metropolis of the island of Cyprus, in 367 or 368. He was living, and still wrote, as St. Jerom assures us, in 392, when he composed his catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers. It is supposed that he

^a Epiphanius, Cypri Salaminæ episcopus, scripsit adversum omnes hæreses libros, & multa alia, quæ ab eruditis propter res, a simplicioribus propter verba læstuntur. Superest usque hodie, & in extrema jam senectute varia cudit opera. De V. l. c. 114.

^b — patrem pene omnium episcoporum, & antiquæ reliquias sanctita-

tis & opere & sermone despicias. Ad Pamm. Ep. 38. al. 61. T. iv. p. 313. m.

^c Crimini ei dandum est, quare Græcam, Syriacam, & Hebræam & Ægyptiam linguam, ex parte & Latinam, noverit? Adv. Ruf. l. ii. p. 417. f. Et Papa Epiphanius ἐπισκοπῶν. Adv. Ruf. l. iii. p. 443. in.

died in the beginning of the year 403. In^d the year 373, or the beginning of 374, he wrote the book entitled the *Ancore*; his *Panarium*, or large work against Heresies, he^e seems to have begun in 374. For learned men have observed from the work itself, that his article against the Montanists was composed in 375, and that in the year 376, he was got as far as that of the Manichees, and more than half of the whole work. In 392, he^f wrote his treatise of *Weights and Measures*. For a farther account of Epiphanius's life and writings I refer to^g others.

II. In the remaining works of Epiphanius, we find the books of the Old Testament thrice enumerated, and once those of the New. I intend to give an account of all his catalogues.

1. The catalogue, which I shall first observe, is in^h the fourth section of the books of *Weights and Measures*. He reckons the sacred books of the Old Testament to be in number twenty-seven, but reduced to twenty-two, the number of the letters of the Jewish alphabet. The books last mentioned are *Esdra*s, (meaning our *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*;) and *Esther*. After which he adds; 'Forⁱ as for those two books, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, — they likewise are useful, but not brought into the same number with the foregoing; and therefore are not placed in the ark of the covenant.' In the next section he observes, that^k the epistles of Baruch were not received by the Jews, but only the Lamentations, added to the book of Jeremiah.

2. In the twenty-third section of the same work, the Jewish books are again enumerated, and put down in their Hebrew names; where the three last mentioned are the two books of *Esdra*s and *Esther*.

3. A third catalogue of the books of the Old Testament is in the *Panarium*, and not very far from the beginning of it. This I shall now transcribe at large. 'Now^l the Jews had

^d Saint Epiphane. Art. ix. Tillem. Mem. E. T. x.

^e Tillem. ib. Art. xi. & Petav. Animadv. in Epiph. T. ii. p. 4.

^f Tillem. as before, art. 13.

^g Cav. Hist. Lib. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 414. &c. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. x. p. 484. &c.

^h T. ii. p. 161, 162.

ⁱ Αἱ γὰρ εἰρηρεῖς δύο βιβλίοι, ἡ τὴν σοδομικὴν ἢ παλαρὶος λεγόμενη· καὶ ἡ τὴν ἰσραὴλ τὴν οὐραχί· — καὶ αὗται χρησιμοὶ μὲν ἴσιν καὶ ἀφελίμοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀριθμοὶ βιβλίων

ἐκ ἀναφερόμεναι — διὸ δὲ εἰς τὴν τῆς διαθήκης κιβρίδι. De Menf. & Pond. n. iv. p. 162.

^k — καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς ἐν τῇ ἱερουσαλὴμ. Φησὶ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἱερὸν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς βαρὺν, ἡ καὶ ἐν κιβρίδι ἐπιτοδοῦναι παρ' ἑβραίων; ἢ μόνον τὴν ἱερουσαλὴμ τῇ ἱερουσαλὴμ συναφθεῖσα. lb. n. 5. p. 163. A.

^l Ἐσχάτως δὲ εἰς οἱ ἱσραὴλ αὐτῶν τῆς ἀπὸ βαβυλωνος αἰχμαλωτίας ἐπαποδοῦναι βιβλὸς τε καὶ προφῆτας τελέει· κ. λ. H. 8. n. 6. T. i. p. 19.

p. 302.

these prophets, and books of prophets, until the return from the Babylonish captivity: the first Genesis, the second Exodus, the third Leviticus, the fourth Numbers, the fifth Deuteronomy, the sixth the book of Joshua the son of Nun, the seventh the book of the Judges, the eighth the book of Ruth, the ninth the book of Job, the tenth the Psalter, the eleventh the Proverbs of Solomon, the twelfth the Ecclesiastes, the thirteenth the Song of Songs, the fourteenth the first book of the Kingdoms, the fifteenth the second book of the Kingdoms, the sixteenth the third book of the Kingdoms, the seventeenth the fourth book of the Kingdoms, the eighteenth the first book of the Remains, the nineteenth the second book of the Remains, the twentieth the book of the twelve Prophets, the twenty-first Isaiah the Prophet, the twenty-second Jeremiah the prophet, with the Lamentations, and his epistle, and the epistle of Baruch, the twenty-third Ezekiel the Prophet, the twenty-fourth Daniel the Prophet, the twenty-fifth the first book of Esdras, the twenty-sixth the second book, the twenty-seventh Esther. And these are the seven and twenty books, which were given by God to the Jews: though they are reckoned only two and twenty, according to the number of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet; for ten of the books that are double are reduced to five. There are also two other books among them, which ^m are doubted of, the Wisdom of Sirach, and of Solomon, beside ⁿ certain other that are apocryphal.

III. I do not stay to make remarks upon these catalogues of the books of the Old Testament; the reader is able to do that of himself. I proceed to the catalogue of the books of the New Testament, which is in another article of the same work of this author.

Had^o you, Aëtius, been born of the Spirit, and been taught by the prophets and apostles, you would have read the seven and twenty books of the Old Testament, from the creation of the world to the time of Esther, which are reckoned two and twenty; and also the four holy gospels, and the fourteen epistles of the holy apostle Paul, and the Acts of the apostles, and the catholic epistles of James, and Peter, and John, and Jude, and the Revelation of John, and the Wisdoms of Solomon and Sirach, and in a word all the divine scriptures.

^m το αμφιδοκία.

ⁿ Χωρίς άλλων τοιαύτων αναποκρυφών.

p. 302.

^o H. 76. σολομωνιος τε φημι, και υμη σιραχ, και πασαι απλως γραφαις θειαις. Ibid.

— εν τε ταις σωφισταις

IV. I shall add divers passages of Epiphanius, concerning the several parts or books of the New Testament.

1. Matthew^a both preached, and wrote a gospel in Hebrew. And^b he wrote first, because^c he had been called from the receipt of the customs, and from many sins. It was therefore fit he should shew, that *Jesus came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.* See Matt. ix. 13.

2. Matthew^d wrote in Hebrew; and he is the only writer of the New Testament who made use of that language. However, Epiphanius had heard, that the gospel of John, and the Acts of the apostles, had been translated from Greek into Hebrew, and^e were in the library of the Jews at Tiberias. Of this he had been assured by some Jewish believers. He says nothing here particularly of the epistle to the Hebrews; and must therefore, I think, be understood to suppose, that it was originally written in Greek, as the other books of the New Testament were, excepting only the gospel of St. Matthew.

3. Matthew wrote first, and Mark, as^f he says, soon after, being a companion of Peter at Rome. Moreover, according to Epiphanius, Mark was one of Christ's seventy-two disciples, and likewise one of those who were offended at the words of Christ recorded John vi. 44. and then forsook him, but was afterwards recovered by Peter, and being filled with the Spirit, wrote a gospel.

4. The third gospel^g is that of Luke. He too was one of Christ's seventy-two disciples, who took offence at the same words that Mark did. He was recovered by Paul, and was^h moved by the Spirit to write a gospel.

5. At lengthⁱ John also, moved by the Spirit, wrote a gospel, after he had long declined it, through humility, when he

^a Οὗτος μὲν ὁ ματθαῖος ἑβραίοις γραμμάσι γραφεὶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ κηρύττει. H. 51. n. 5. p. 426. A. ^b Ματθαῖος γὰρ πρῶτος εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. Ib. n. 4. p. 425. B. Vid. & n. 5. p. 425. C. D.

^c — καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἔδει γὰρ τὸν ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἐπιστρέψαντα, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἁγίων ἀναστροφῆς. κ. λ. Ib. n. 5. p. 425.

^d Ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν, οἱ ματθαῖος μόνος ἑβραῖς καὶ ἑβραίοις γραμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ποιεῖσθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐκδίδει τε καὶ κηρύττει. H. 30. n. iii. p. 127. C.

^e Ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἰουδαίων γαστροφυλακίοις — ἐν τῇ τιμῇ. Ibid.

^f Εὐθύς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ματθαίου ἀκολουθῶς γενομένου ὁ μαρκὸς τῷ αἰῶνι πύρρην ἐν Ῥώμῃ — ὁμῶς διὰ πύρρην ἀνακαμψῆς εὐαγγελίζεσθαι καλεῖσθαι, πτωματικῶν πύρρην. H. 51. n. 6. p. 428. A.

^g Οἱ ἰδὲ τρεῖς εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν. Τὸ γὰρ ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃ τῷ Λουκᾶ, οὗ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐδιδόκησεν διὰ τῶν διασκορπισθέντων ἐπὶ τῷ τῷ σωτήρος λόγῳ, διὰ δὲ πάλιν τῷ αἰῶνι πάλιν ἀνακαμψῆς πρὸς τοὺς κήρυον. H. 51. n. 11. p. 433. C.

^h — ἀνακαμψῆς τὸ αἰῶνι πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐπιστρέφει τὸν αἰῶνι Λουκᾶν. — Ib. n. viii. p. 428.

ⁱ Διὸ ὑμεῖς ἀνακαμψῆς τῷ αἰῶνι πνεύματι τοῦ ἰωάννου παραίσταται εὐαγγελισθῆναι, δι' ἐνδοξίας καὶ ταπεινότητος, ἐπὶ τῇ γραφῇ αὐτοῦ ἡλικίᾳ, μετὰ δὲ ἐνδοξίας τῆς αὐτοῦ ζωῆς, μετὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς παλιν ἐπιστροφῆς, τῆς ἐπὶ κλειδίᾳ γενομένης καίσαρος, καὶ μετὰ ἡλικίᾳ δὲ τῇ διαβρίθαι αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ [ἐπὶ] τῆς ἀσπασίας ἀναγκαζέσθαι ἐκδίδει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. H. 51. n. xii. p. 433. D. 434. A.

was more than ninety years of age, and when he had lived many years in Asia, after his return thither from Patmos, in the time of the emperor Claudius.

6. He likewise says, that ^b John, the fourth and last in order of time, was first in respect to the sublimity of his matter.

7. Epiphanius does moreover say in several places, that ^c John's gospel was occasioned by the errors of the Ebionites, the Cerinthians, the Merinthians, and Nazarenes.

8. In his Ancorate he says, there ^d are four gospels, and in them a thousand one hundred and sixty-two sections, or chapters; which is very near the number of Eusebius's canon.

9. Again, in his large work, having observed the different characters of the four evangelists, and the beginnings of their several gospels, and that John wrote last, supplying some things omitted by the former: hence, says ^e he, it has come to pass, that we have a full account of what concerns both Christ's humanity and divinity.

10. In an argument, he in one place mentions the gospels in this order: According ^f to the gospel of Luke, and of John, and of Matthew and Mark.

11. Epiphanius ascribes the book of the Acts to ^g Luke.

12. It is needless to take notice of any quotations of Paul's epistles. That to the Hebrews is frequently cited as Paul's; and as expressly as any other of his epistles. But the reader, if he thinks fit, may observe the place where ^h our author speaks of the order of Paul's epistles, and says, that sometimes that to the Hebrews was reckoned the tenth, being placed before the epistle to Timothy, Titus and Philemon. In other copies it was the fourteenth.

13. The epistle of James is quoted by him ⁱ sometimes.

14. He says, that ^k Joseph had by his first wife four sons: James, called the Lord's brother, because he was brought up with him, and Simon, and Jude, and John, and two daughters, Anna and Salome. In another place he says, that ^l Joseph

^b Τίσιος γὰρ κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἔλθων ὁ μαρκίος, πρῶτος μὲν ὢν, ὑπερὸς δὲ τοῖς ἑτέροις ἐναγγελισαμένος, κ. λ. H. 51. n. 19. p. 441. D. Et Conf. H. 69. n. 23. p. 746. 747. ^c Vid. H. 51. n. 2. p. 443. n. 12. p. 434. B. C. H. 69. n. 22, 23. ^d Τεσσαρά μὲν ἐστὶν ἐναγγελία, καὶ ὅλως χίλιον ἑκατὸν ἑξήκοντα δύο. Ancor. C. 30. p. 54. B. ^e — καὶ ἀπο τῶν ἑστέων ἐναγγελιστῶν τῶν παλαιῶν κατὰ τὴν γὰρ καὶ κατὰ τὴν θεοῦ ἀκριβεῖαν καὶ ἀρχαίαν. H. 51. n. 19. p. 442. B.

^f Καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Λουκᾶν ἐναγγελίας, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Μάρκον, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Ματθαίον. H. 51. n. 28. p. 450. C. ^g Καὶ πρῶτος ἐν τῷ πλῶνι ὡς οὐδόνηκος ψυχῶν, φησὶν ὁ Λουκᾶς ὁ συγγραψάμενος τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων. Ancor. n. 59. p. 61. D. ^h Vid. H. 42. p. 373. C. D. Conf. Mill. Prolegom. n. 236—238. ⁱ Vid. H. 31. n. 34. p. 206. B. H. 77. n. 27. p. 1021. C. ^k Ancor. n. 60. p. 62. D. ^l H. 51. n. 10. p. 432. D.

was married to Mary when he was about eighty years of age, having had by a former wife six children. He elsewhere also speaks largely of James, saying, that ^m he was the Lord's brother, and his apostle, and the first bishop of Jerusalem, and other things which need not now to be attended to.

15. He has several times quoted the two epistles of Peter.

16. He says, that ⁿ Peter was often in the countries of Pontus and Bithynia.

17. John's second epistle is quoted by ^o Epiphanius.

18. He cites very expressly ^p the catholic epistle of Jude, the apostle, brother of James, and of the Lord, written by inspiration.

19. Speaking of these seven epistles, it is common for him to use the word 'catholic.' He quotes St. John's first epistle in this manner: of ^q whom the holy John says in the catholic epistles, *It is the last time. And ye have heard, that Antichrist cometh.* See 1 John ii. 18.

20. Epiphanius received the book of the Revelation: for he says, that ^r John imparted spiritual gifts by his gospel, his epistles, and the Revelation.

21. And in the preceding chapter he had said, that ^s all John's books or writings, his gospel, and Revelation, and epistles, were harmonious.

22. He says, that ^t John prophesied, or had the Revelation, in the Isle of Patmos, in the reign of Claudius, if that be not a fault of the transcriber.

23. The book of the Revelation was not universally received in the time of Epiphanius. His account of the Alogians is, that they rejected all St. John's writings. And he says, that ^u if they had rejected the Revelation only, it might have been imagined, that they had acted upon the ground of

^m Καλαραβειλος ενθως ιακωβ τω αδελφω κυριω καλεσμενω, και αποστολω, επισκοπω περιωκη, νικη τη ιωσηφ φουσι ολιος, ενταξει δε αδελφω τη κυριω κληθειλος δια την συναντασιν. H. 29. n. 3. p. 119. A. Vid. 8. n. 4.

ⁿ Πιπρος δε πολλας ποιουν τε και βιβλιαν επισκευαλο. H. 27. n. 6. p. 107. D. ^o H. 34. n. 13. p. 248. A.

^p ως και περι τωων οικμαι εκληθη το αγιον πνευμα εν τω αποστολω ιωδα, λεγω δε εν τη υπ' αυτου γραφειση καθολικη επιστολη. κ. λ. H. 26. n. 11. p. 92. D.

^q Περι αυ ειπεν ο αγιος ιωαννης εν ταυς καθολικαις επιστολαις. H. 51. n. 3. p. 428. A.

^r Εν ος και ο αγιος ιωαννης δια τη ευαγγελιω, και των επιστολων, και της αποκα-

λυψεως εκ τη αυτη χαρισματος τη αυτη πνευματος μιλαδεδωκε. H. 51. n. 35. p. 437. C.

^s — τα τα αυτη αποστολη βιβλια, φημι δε ιωαννη το τε ευαγγελιον, και απαντα αυτου, ταχα δε και επιστολας. Συνεδει γαρ και αυται τω ευαγγελιω, και τη απ' αυτου καλυψει. Ib. n. 34. p. 456. C.

^t Αυτη δε προφητευσατος εν χρονος κλεισθαι καισαρος αναλειψαι, ος εις της παλαιας ηςον υπηρξει. Ib. n. 33. p. 456. A. Conf. n. 12. p. 434. A.

^u Και η μεν ιδεοχολο το ευαγγελιον, της δε απαντα αυτου απιβαλλουσα, ελεγονται αυ, μη σφαρα κατα ακριβολογια τοιουτω ποιησαι, απ' ης ουκ ην δεχομενοι, δια τα εν τη απαντα αυτου βαθεως και σκυλευως σημειωματα. H. 51. n. 3. p. 423. D.

a nice and critical judgment; as being shy of an apocryphal and mysterious book: but to reject all John's writings, was a sign of an antichristian spirit.

24. In another place he says, the ^x Revelation was generally received, or by the most.

V. We may now take some of the many passages of this writer, testifying the great respect shewn by Christians to the sacred scriptures, together with their general titles and divisions.

1. One ^r and the same God is preached to us in the law, and the prophets, and the gospels, and the apostles, in the Old and the New Testament.

2. He particularly examines the texts alleged by the Arians from ^s the apostle, and from the gospels.

3. The ^a apostle, or rather the Holy Ghost speaking in the apostle.

4. A ^b thing never said by any of the ancients, not by any prophet, or apostle, or evangelist, or interpreter to this day.

5. Arguing against the followers of Origen, he says: The ^c prophets and apostles are more to be relied upon than you, or your master.

6. Against the Valentinians. Their ^d fables and fancies have no countenance from scripture, not from Moses, nor from any of the prophets after him, nor from our Saviour, nor from his evangelists, or apostles.

7. That, and other like passages plainly shew, what writings were of authority in the church, and that there were no other to which that honour was allowed.

8. Again: Such ^e a thing was never said by any of the prophets: not by Moses, nor by any of the prophets before or after him, nor by the evangelists or apostles.

9. If we ^f deny the authority of the divine scriptures, we are

^x — παρα πολλοις η βιβλος περιε-
μεν. H. 77. n. 26. p. 1031. B.

^r Αλλ' ος θεος εις ημιν εν νομω, και εν
προφηταις, και εν ευαγγελισταις, και εν
αποστολοις, εν παλαια και καινη διαθηκη
κηρυτται. De Fide. n. 18. p. 1101. B.

^a — μίαν πασαν εν απο τη αποστολη,
και τα ευαγγελια. H. 69. n. 72.

^b Φησιν ομοιως γενεα αποστολος μαλλον δε
το πνευμα το αγιον φηγομενον εν αυτω.
H. 76. n. 9. p. 922. C.

^c Ουδεν
γα παντι των παλαιων τυλο ειρηται, ητε
προφηται, ητε αποστολοι, ητε ευαγγελισται, η
ουτοι ιερειαι ενωσ τελων των ημερων
ησαν. H. 77. n. 24. p. 1018. B.

^d Αποδοσει γαρ οι αποστολοι και προφη-

ται, ητες υμεις και υμων διδασκαλος. An-
cor. n. 63. p. 66. C.

^e — εις τα
γραφας εισασης, εις τα μυστικω νομω, εις
τινος προφητη των μίαν μωσται, αλλ' εις
τη σωτηριαν, εις των αυτων ευαγγελιστων, αλλ'
εις μην των αποστολων. H. 31. n. 34. p.
205. C.

^f — ουδεις παποτε των
προφητων τυλο ειρηκοις, ουκ αυτη μωσταις,
ου των προ αυτου ου των μετ' αυτου ουκ των
ευαγγελιστων, ου των αποστολων. H. 33. n.
8. p. 223. C.

^g Εαν γαρ αρτισωμεθα
τας θειας γραφας, αληθειαν ου εσμεν, και
ευρισκομεθα εκπλητοις της αληθειας, η της
παλαιαν διαθηκης εκβαλλοις, ουκ εις εσμεν
της καθολικης εκκλησιας. H. 70. n. 7.
p. 817. D.

fallen

fallen from truth: if we reject the Old Testament, we are no longer of the catholic church.

10. Let ^s these people, says he, produce any passage of the Old or the New Testament favouring their sentiments.

11. He complains, that ^b some men neglecting the truth of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles, have introduced false and fabulous notions.

12. He professeth ¹ to have delivered the true faith, taken from the law, and the prophets, and the gospels, and the apostles.

13. This they must allow, unless ^s they admit fables, contrary to the doctrine of the prophets, and the law, and the apostles, and evangelists.

VI. I shall now put down a few remarkable observations in this writer.

1. He says, that ¹ when Christ was baptized, he was of the age of twenty-nine years and ten months. This he supposeth to be the meaning of St. Luke's words, iii. 23. *And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age*: that is, thirty years not complete.

2. He thinks, our ^m Lord was exactly thirty years of age, when he wrought the miracle at Cana in Galilee, recorded John ii. 1—11.

3. He says, there ^a are two passovers in our Lord's ministry, according to St. John's gospel; and that he suffered at the third passover, in the ^o thirty-third year of his life on earth. Therefore he did not think the *feast of the Jews*, mentioned John v. 1. to be passover.

4. In another place he says, there ^p were three passovers in our Lord's ministry: but he is to be understood in the same manner as above represented.

8 Εἰ ἔχουσι μαρτυρίαν — ἐν παλαιᾷ καὶ ἐν καινῇ διαθήκῃ. Ancor. n. 1. p. 54. B.

Ἡ τὴν γὰρ θείων γραφῶν ἀκολουθίαν, καὶ εὐδολίαν, καὶ ἀκακίας ὁμολοσίαν, προφητικὴν τε, καὶ εὐαγγελικὴν, καὶ ἀποστολικὴν πιστὴν παρρησίαν, σοφιστικὴν ἡμῶν λίσιν, καὶ μυθωδὴν παρρησιασάν. H. 77. n. 1. p. 996. B.

¹ Καὶ οὕτω γεγραφα — βεβαίαιον ὁμολοσίαν τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ νομῆ, καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ εὐαγγελίων, καὶ ἀποστόλων. Ancor. n. 83. p. 88.

^k — ἐκ προφητῶν τε, καὶ νομῆ, καὶ ἀποστόλων, καὶ εὐαγγελιστῶν παράδοσις. H. 70. n. 2. p. 813. C.

¹ Ἡ γὰρ τῶν μὲν οὐκ εἰκοσιετία ἔσαν, καὶ μὴν δέκα, οἱ ἐπὶ τὸ βαπτισμα ἦκε, τριακοῦτα μὲν ἔσαν, ἀλλ' οὐ πληρῆς. H. 51. n. 16. p. 439. A. Conf. n. 28. p. 450. A.

^m Ὅπερ πρῶτον ση-

μεῖον καὶ πληρωμα τριακοῦτα ἔσαν ἀποχριστικῶς τῆς ἐσαρκῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας. κ. λ. H. 51. n. 16. p. 439. C.

ⁿ Ὅμως δύο πασχα μὲν κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς κηρύξεως, ὁ δὲ οὗτος ποιεῖται, καὶ τῶν τριῶν πασχα. H. 51. n. 30. p. 452. C.

^o Εὐρισκίται γὰρ ἐν τῷ τριακῶν τριῶν εἶναι τῆς αὐτῆς ἐσαρκωτικῆς παρουσίας πασχα ὁ μορφιστῆς. H. 51. n. 23. p. 446. B.

— ἐν τῷ τριακῶν τριῶν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐσαρκῆς οἰκονομίας. Ib. n. 25. p. 448. A.

^p Καὶ ἐκ οὐδενὸς οἱ ἰδιῶται, οἱ δὲ μὲν δύο πασχα ὁμολοῦσι τὰ εὐαγγέλια, ἀλλὰ δύο μὲν πρῶτα λέγουσι, καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ οὗτος, τρία πασχα τῶν ἐν τῇ πνευματικῇ περιπραγματιζομένων. Ibid. n. 22. p. 444. B.

5. He thought that ^a the two disciples, whom Jesus met in the way to Emmaus, as related Luke xxiv. were Nathanael and Cleophas.

6. Epiphanius says, that ^r the apostles did not preach themselves, but Jesus Christ, Lord. Therefore there was no sect, or church, called after the apostles; for we never heard of Petrians, or Paulians, or Bartholomeans, or Thaddeans, but of Christians only, as they were called at Antioch. We saw a like observation some while ago in ¹ Athanasius.

7. He says, all ^t things in the divine scripture are easy to those who enquire with a pious mind.

VII. The sum of his testimony will lie in a little room. His canon of the Old Testament was much the same with that of the Jews: for he acknowledges, that the book of Baruch was not received by them. The book of Wisdom, and the book of Ecclesiasticus, he considers as useful only, and not of authority, and therefore not admitted into the ark. Nor have the books of Maccabees, or Tobit, or Judith, any place in those catalogues. The books of the New Testament received by him, are the same as those which are now generally received by us. He quotes no others, as of authority, unless he has so quoted the Constitutions; which will be considered presently. For the sacred books of the Old and New Testament he has the highest regard. I scarce need to say, that he makes no use of Christian apocryphal books, written in the name of apostles, and falsely ascribed to them. Epiphanius's aversion for such books must be well known to the readers of this work: it is a charge frequently brought by him against heretics, that ^u they made use of apocryphal books: and he reckons it no small fault in them.

^a H. 29. n. 6.

^r — Διο εκ ενι
αμεις, ουδε εκκλησια, εις ονομα αποστολων
αποστολων· ουδε ποτε γαρ ηκουσαμεν η
αμεις, η παυλις, η βαρθολομαις, η θαδ-
δαις, κ. λ. H. 42. p. 366. D.

^t p. 282.

^u Παντα γαρ σαφη
α τη θεια γραφη τοις βαλομενοις ευσεβει

λοισμω προσερχισθαι τω θειω λογω. H.
76. n. 7. p. 920. A.

^u This he imputes to Bardesanes. See
Vol. ii. ch. 28. n. 12. and to several
others, as may be seen, Vol. iii. ch. 41.
p. 20—23. Not to refer to other places.

C H A P. LXXXV.

THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS AND CANONS.

I. Epiphanius's quotations of a work called *Apostolical Constitutions*, with remarks upon them. II. The opinions of learned moderns concerning the *Apostolical Constitutions* now in being. III. An argument upon them proposed. IV. They are written in the name of the apostles of Christ: V. But are destitute of the external evidence necessary to support that claim: not being quoted by the Christian writers of the first three centuries. VI. They are also destitute of internal evidence: 1. The quotations of the books of the New Testament not suiting the apostles. 2. Having in them many things later than the times of the apostles: 3. Some things unworthy of the apostles. 4. Inconsistencies, and false history. 5. Expressions, betraying a later time than is pretended. VII. Consequently they are an imposture. VIII. The author's testimony to the books of the New Testament. IX. The *Apostolical Canons*.

I. As a work called *Apostolical Constitutions* is cited by Epiphanius, and he is the first Christian writer who has quoted any book with that title, I shall here put down his (A) several citations, and sometimes with the connection.

1. In his forty-fifth heresy, that of the Severians, who were Encratites, and condemned the use of wine, he observes: 'The^a Lord says, *I am the true Vine*. [John xv. 1.] If the vine had been evil, he would not have used that expression. Moreover the apostles, in the work called the Constitution, say, that the catholic church is the plantation and vineyard of the Lord. Yea, and the Lord himself has again in the gospel a parable of a vineyard.' See Luke xx. and Matt. xx.

2. In his seventieth heresy, that of the Audians, who were for keeping Easter at the same time with the Jews, he says: 'For^b this purpose they allege the Constitution of the Apostles: which book, though it be with many of doubtful authority, is not to be rejected; for it contains the whole order of

(A) All the passages of Epiphanius, with remarks, may be seen in Grabe's *Spicil.* T. i. p. 46—55. as well as elsewhere.

a — Αλλά και οι αποστολοι φασιν εν τη διαλαξει τη καλημενη· Οι φυλεια θεου και αμπελων η καθολικη εκκλησια. Αλλα και αυτος ο κυριος παλιν εν τω ευαγγελιω ποιημενος της τω αμπελωνος παραβολην. λ. Epiph. H. 45. p. 390. A. B. Vid. Const. Ap. l. i. in.

b Εις τοιο δε οι αυτοι αυδιανοι παραφερουσι την των αποστο-

λων διαλαξιν, εσαν μετ τοις πολλοις εν αυτη φιλικω, αλλ' οκ αδοκιμον· πασα γαρ η αυτη κατονικη ταξις εμφερεται, και εδω παρακρηχαλασμενον της πιστεις, και της εκκλησιας διοικησιως, και κατορος, και πιστεις. — Οριζουσι γαρ εν τη αυτη διαλαξει η αποστολοι, οι υμεις μη ψηφισετε, αλλα ποιειτε, οταν οι αδελφοι υμων οι εκ περιουσιας μετ αυτων αμα ποιειτε—λεσθεις ει η αν τη πλανηθωσι, μηδε υμιν μελειω. H. 70. p. 10. p. 822. A. B. 823. A.

' church-

with re-
turning the
them pro-
rist: V.
at claim:
ies. VI.
the books
hem many
worthy of
betraying
impossi-
nt. IX.

ited by
quoted
several

ho were
serves:
If the
pression.
tution,
ineyard
n in the
t. XX.
no were
e says:
postiles:
thority,
order of

As is an-
α γὰρ ἡ
ἐκείνῃ
καὶ τῆς
διαλέξε-
ἡ, ἀλλὰ
πρὸς τὴν
ἡ. 70. p.

church-

church-government, and has nothing in it contrary to the ecclesiastical discipline, or the canon, or the faith. But they misunderstand the direction concerning Easter, which they allege for the support of their practice. For the apostles in the Constitution appoint to this purpose: Do not you make computation of the time, say they, but keep it together with your brethren who are of the circumcision, at the same time that they do.—And though they should be mistaken, let not that give you any concern.' I put in the margin a part of Grabe's note upon this passage.

3. Epiphanius afterwards^d mentions several things, as sayings, or ordinances of the apostles, and some of them as contrary to the above-mentioned direction, and from the same work, as is reckoned.

4. In the seventy-fifth heresy, which is that of the Aërians, who were against set times of fasting and feasting under the gospel-dispensation, Epiphanius having quoted to them 1 Cor. v. 7. and Acts xx. 16. goes on: 'And^e if authority is to be fetched from the Constitution of the apostles, it may be easily shewn, how they have there appointed a fast on the fourth, and on the sixth day of the week for ever [or always], except in Pentecost: and that in the six days of Easter no food ought to be taken, beside bread, and salt, and water.'

5. In the eightieth heresy, which is that of the Messalians and others: 'And^f concerning the beard the divine word and doctrine in the Constitutions of the Apostles says, that it should not be corrupted, that is, that the hair of the beard

^e Contrarium plane præcipitur in istis, quibus modo utimur, Constitutionibus Clementis. l. v. c. 17.—Unde Cotelerius ad hunc locum: Recte, inquit, observarunt docti homines, Constitutionem hujus capituli diversam esse a Constitutione, de qua Epiphanius in hæresi Audianorum. Immo non solum diversa est, sed e diametro contradi-
cti. Grad. Sp. T. i. p. 46.

^d Εξ αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν ἐκείνῃ περιλαμβανόμενων ἢ τῶν ἀντιθέ-
ται ὁμοιωταί. Φαίνεται γὰρ τῇ ἀστυνίᾳ
ὅτι μετὰ τὴν αὐτῶν τῶν ἀστυνίᾳ. Ib. n. 10.
p. 823. A.

Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οἱ αὐτοὶ ἀποστολοὶ, οἱ εἰς
αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαι, οὗτοι ἐκτελεστοὶ ὑπὲρ αὐ-
τῶν περὶ τῆς, οἱ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑορτῆς τῶν χριστῶν
ἐκτελεστοί. κ. λ. Ib. n. 11. p. 823. C.
Vid. Const. l. v. c. 15.

Ἀλλὰ αὐτῶν ἀκρόασις ἐν τῇ διαλέξει, οἱ οὐ
καὶ αὐτῶν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν κυριακῇ, ἐπικατα-
στήσιν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ. Ib. p. 223. D. Const.

l. v. cap. 20.

—τὴν ἑορτὴν πασχα, τῷ τῇ ἐξ ὁ-
μαδα τῆς ὁρισμένης, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν
ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ διαλέξει. Ib. n. 12. p.
824. C.

^e Εἰ δὲ καὶ χρὴ τὸ τῆς διαλέξεως τῶν
ἀποστόλων λείπειν, πῶς ἐκεῖ ὁρίζοιτο τὴν ἡμέραν
καὶ προσάββατον ἡγεῖται διὰ παντός, χωρὶς
περίληψης καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐξ ἡμερῶν τῆς πασ-
χα, πῶς παραγγέλλουσιν, μηδὲν ὅλας λαμ-
βάνειν, ἢ ἀβλῆ, καὶ ἄλος, καὶ ὕδατος· ποιεῖν
τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶν, πῶς τὴν ἀπολύειν εἰς ἐπι-
φωσκησάντων κυριακῇ. Φαίνεται ἐστὶ. κ. λ. H.
75. n. 6. p. 910. B. C. D. Const. Const.
l. v. cap. 15. 20. l. vii. c. 23. l. v. c. 13.
15. 18, 19.

^f Καὶ περὶ μὲν ἐν τῇ
γενεῇ ἐν ταῖς διαλέξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων φασ-
κεῖ ὁ θεὸς λόγος καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία, μὴ φθει-
ρῆναι, τῷ τῇ μὴ τιμῶν τρεῖς γενεῖς. κ. λ.
H. 80. n. 7. p. 1073. C. Vid. Const. l. i.
cap. 3.

‘ should not be cut, and that men should not wear a meretricious dress, nor yet make a shew of religion.’

6. There seems also to be a reference to this book in his *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*. I put a part of the passage^a at the bottom of the page; as also a remark of Grabe^b upon it. Upon these quotations we may now observe as follows.

1. We hence perceive, that in the time of Epiphanius there was a work called *Apostolical Constitutions*: and the things therein contained seem to have been written, as in those we now have, in the name of the apostles. There were likewise in that work directions concerning Easter, and Pentecost, and other set days of fasting, or feasting, as in ours.

2. Nevertheless there is reason to think, that (B) the *Constitutions* mentioned by Epiphanius, are not the same with those which we now have. The order concerning keeping Easter is quite different in ours from that quoted by the *Audians*: nor does Epiphanius say, that their quotation was false; though indeed he alleges some things, which seem contrary to the rule by which they governed themselves.

3. Epiphanius bears witness, that the *Constitutions*, which were in being in his time, were ‘doubted of by many,’ and were not generally received.

^a Συναγῆς δὲ ἐπιτελεσμεναι ταχθῆναι εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων τετραδὶ καὶ προσαββάτω, καὶ κυριακῇ τετραδὶ δὲ καὶ ἐν προσαββάτῳ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἕως ἡμέρας ἑνῆδεκα. κ. λ. *Exp. Fid.* n. 22. p. 1104.

^b Quod de sacris conventibus feria iv. & vi. nec non Dominica die celebrandis dicit Epiphanius, in nostris Constitutionibus non exstat. Hæque ideo ab antiqua Apostolorum Διδάχῃ in hoc puncto differunt. Grabe ib. p. 53.

(B) Petavius, in his notes upon Epiphanius, supposeth the *Constitutions*, mentioned by his author, to be different from ours. De *Constitutionibus* istæ dubietatem a nonnullis præfatur Epiphanius. Quo eodem nomine circumferuntur hodie in octo libros distinctæ, quæ a prioribus illis, ac nihilominus dubiis, quarum meminit Epiphanius, diversæ videntur. Etenim quinque ex illis sententiæ hoc & sequenti numero citantur, quæ in vulgatis nunquam reperiuntur: imo vero contraria quædam in iis leguntur. Nam lib. v. cap. 16. de Paschatis celebritate catholicorum dogma propalam edicitur, uti post æquinoctium celebraretur. Tum ne cum Judæis agatur, & alia quædam: quæ si in antiquis illis

Constitutionibus legebantur, mirum est hoc tam præsentī ac disertō testimonio usum non esse contra Audianos Epiphanius, qui Judæorum more celebrandum Pascha iisdem ex *Constitutionibus* affirmabant. Apparet igitur, aliud fuisse *Constitutionum* genus, quam quibus hodie Clementis nomen inscribitur. *Animadv.* in H. lxx. p. 290, 291.

Grabe was of opinion, that the *Constitutions* quoted by Epiphanius were not only different from ours, but that they were the *Doctrine*, or *Doctrines* of the Apostles, mentioned by Eusebius and Athanasius, and shorter than ours. Equidem id lubens concedo, *Doctrinam Apostolorum*, ab Eusebio & Athanasio memoratam eandem fuisse cum Διδάχῃ sive *Constitutione Apostolica* ab Epiphanio aliquoties laudata. — Sed illas, quibus modo utimur, *Constitutiones Apostolicas* Clementi adscriptas, nego easdem esse cum διδασκαίᾳ seu διδασκαλίᾳ Apostolorum, licet in quibusdam capitulis conveniant. *Spic.* p. 41. — contra quam hypothesein supra p. 41, & seqq. evici, διδασκαίᾳ, sive *Constitutiones* Epiphani, diversas a nostris, nec adeo prolixas, vel in plures libros divisas fuisse. *Ib.* p. 284.

4. That

4. That expression, 'doubted of by many,' or 'of doubtful authority with many,' seems to be ambiguous. It may denote, that it was doubted, whether the book should be esteemed canonical; or else, whether it was an ecclesiastical book, and not apocryphal and heretical, and utterly to be rejected. And it may be thought, that this last is the true meaning of the expression, for these two reasons: first, when Epiphanius gives an account of the canonical books of scripture, he takes no notice of this. Secondly, when he says: 'it is not to be rejected, for it has nothing in it contrary to the discipline of the church, or the canon, or the faith;' he seems only to assert, that it was a good, ecclesiastical, or catholic writing. When therefore he says, that this book was 'doubted of by many,' he intimates, that some suspected it to be the work of some heretics: in opposition to which he says, it ought not to be rejected. For it appeared from the contents of it to be the work of some honest, orthodox, or catholic Christian. Daillé has argued¹ in a like manner.

5. It is not easy to say what respect Epiphanius himself had for this work. He quotes things from it, as ordinances of the apostles, and as the divine word and doctrine: but it is not mentioned in any of the passages, where he gives the catalogues of the books of scripture, exhibited in the preceding chapter. Moreover, the expressions of his just taken notice of, seem to imply no more, than that the book was an ecclesiastical or orthodox writing: farther, either his Constitutions were not the same as ours, or he had not much regard for them. For in our Constitutions divers early heretics are named: and they are condemned and confuted: of which passages nevertheless Epiphanius has made no use of in his history of those heretics, or in his arguments against them: which every one must be apt to think he would have done, if the Constitutions which we have, had been then in being, and had been esteemed by him as of authority.

6. Whatever was the opinion of Epiphanius, about the work quoted in the passages of his just recited, or referred to, there can be no good reason for us to suppose, it was a book of

¹ At non ideo fit, ut libros a Clemente vere scriptos, vereque ab Apostolis instituta dictaque, quæcumque in illis narrantur, fuisse crediderit. Multis enim libris nihil inest vel a fide, vel a disciplina alienum, quos non idcirco dixeris vel Clementinos, vel Apostolicos. Omnino videtur Epiphanius sensisse, illas Apostolorum nomine

tam vulgatas Diataxes boni & Catholici viri opus esse non inutile, iisque sincere explicatam esse Ecclesie fidem ac disciplinam: Ut a Clemente scriptas, & ab ipsis Apostolis dictas crediderit, nihil sane cogit. De Pseudep. Apostol. l. i. cap. 2. p. 37.

sacred scripture; forasmuch as no such book is quoted as scripture by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, or any other Christian writer of the first three centuries.

If any should say, that Epiphanius's Constitutions are the same with the Doctrine of the Apostles, mentioned by Eusebius and Athanasius, [which has been the opinion of Grabe and some others,] I would answer: That is not certain. Supposing them to be the same, it is manifest, that the book, called the Doctrine of the Apostles, was no book of sacred scripture. It is never quoted by Eusebius, or Athanasius, in any of their writings: they have only once mentioned it, each of them, as a spurious, or useful book, when they give a catalogue of the books of the New Testament: and all other Christian writers before them are quite silent about it. In the Synopsis, ascribed to Athanasius, it is mentioned; but it is ranked with 'contradicted,' or apocryphal books.

II. Having seen the passages of Epiphanius concerning the Apostolical Constitutions of his time, and made remarks on them, I proceed to consider a work which we now have in eight books, with a like title: and I begin with alleging the judgments of divers learned moderns upon them.

1. Cotelierius says: 'It is certain, that the work of the Apostolical Constitutions in eight books is apocryphal and pseudepigraphal, not composed by the apostles, nor by the apostolical Clement.—Although Epiphanius and Cedrenus have quoted the Constitutions as the divine word; nevertheless it is manifest, that a book cannot be esteemed the work of the apostles, which the earliest times of the church were unacquainted with, which was unknown to the fathers, or neglected by them, which has many marks of forgery and falsehood; which the catholic church excludes from the canon of divine scripture: which, finally, has in it very many things contrary to truth and probability, plainly of a later date than the times of the apostles, and quite different from their true characters.'

2. Tillemont's judgment is not very different from that of Cotelierius: I therefore take it next. 'If the Doctrine of the

* Itaque verum est, Constitutionum Apostolicarum οὐκ ἀποστολικὸν opus esse apocryphum, & pseudepigraphum, ab Apostolis non profectum, nec ab apostolico Clemente.

—Quamvis S. Epiphanius H. 80. 7. & Cedrenus.—*Στοιχ. λογ. διαταξ. τριβ. αὐτ.* attamen iniquo constat, ad Apostolos & Clementem non pertinere *συναγ. μα.* quod prima Ecclesiæ tempora latuit, quod a tot sanctis Patribus ignoratum fuit, aut neglect-

um: quod pluribus suspicionem movit suppositionis, plurimis certitudinem dedit falsitatis: quod Catholica Ecclesia a canone scripturarum divinarum excludit: quod denique sexcenta complectitur cum veritate, cum similitudine pugnantia, recentiora temporibus apostolicis, & apostolico charactere remotissima. Cotel. Jud. de Const. Ap. ap. Patr. Ap. T. i.

† Saint Clement, de Rome. Art. vii. Mem. T. ii.

'Apostles,

Apostles, mentioned by Eusebius and Athanasius, and the Constitutions, are different works, as Du Pin thinks, Epiphanius is the first who has mentioned the Constitutions. — And though the last canon of the apostles ranks them with the canonical scriptures; and though the Ethiopians respect them as sacred and divine scripture; we are nevertheless constrained to own, that there are in them many things contrary to truth and probability, and far different from the time of the apostolical writings.

3. For Du Pin's opinion, I refer at present to his Preliminary^m Dissertation upon the Bible, and to what he writes in hisⁿ account of the Canons and Constitutions ascribed to the apostles, and then^o of Clement of Rome.

Daillé's opinion was, that^p the Constitutions were composed after the council of Nice, and before the end of the fifth century.

5. Mr. Robert Turner thought, the^q Constitutions made use of by Epiphanius to be different from the present Constitutions; and concludes his work, saying: 'That' the eight books of Constitutions seem to have been made out of several doctrines, constitutions, canons, travels, and traditions, ascribed to the apostles, and out of some of the ancient Liturgies, and the discipline and practice of the Greek church, oddly blended together, adulterated and changed by some ignorant Arian in the fifth century.'

6. Pearson was of opinion, that^r the Apostolical Constitutions were formed out of several lesser works, called Doctrines or Constitutions, said to be written by Clement, Ignatius, Hippolytus, and others, but altered and interpolated by the author of this collection: and that the eight books of the Constitutions, as we now have them, were not composed and finished till after the time of Epiphanius. I have now placed Pearson's words somewhat at large at the bottom of the page; and I formerly^s spoke of this opinion of his.

^m L. ii. c. 6. § 10.

ⁿ Biblioth.

Ec. T. i. p. 14. &c. a Amsterdam.

^o Ibid. p. 30. &c.

^p Si tamen, ut in re obscura, conjecturas & argumenta admittere libet; illud inprimis pro certo constitui posse mihi videtur, fuisse hoc opus ante finem quinti sæculi scriptum atque editum. De Pseudep. Ap. i. ii. c. 17. p. 393.

^q Discourse of

the pretended Apostolical Constitutions, p. 198.

^r The same, p. 295.

^s — ex his diversis Didascalii atque

Constitutionibus libros octo Constitutionum Apostolicarum quas habemus confectos atque consarcinatos fuisse, asserere non dubito. — Unde conjicio, octo libros Constitutionum post ævum Epiphani ex veteribus Didascalii atque Diataxibus, immutatis interpolatisque, factos esse. Neque enim ille numerum librorum indicat. Pearf. Vind. Ign. P. i. c. 4. p. 282, 283. Amst. 1698.

^t See the chapter of Hippolytus, Vol. ii.

p. 407.

7. Grabe's opinion was exactly the same as Pearson's. I now also put his words^a below.

8. James Basnage thought, that^a Pearson had hit the time of this work very well. For on the one hand, these eight books of the Apostolical Constitutions were not known in the time of Epiphanius: it might be added, nor of Jerom. On the other hand, the author of the Imperfect Work upon St. Matthew, who wrote after the time of Theodosius, quotes the eighth book: therefore we must place the composing of this large collection at the middle of the fifth century.

9. The opinion of Samuel Basnage may be seen in his^a Annals.

10. The late learned Dr. Waterland has these expressions: 'The^a Clementine Liturgy, though it is not thought to have been ever in public use, is commonly believed to be the oldest of any now extant: and, though as an entire collection, it cannot be justly set higher than the fifth century, yet it certainly contains many things derived from earlier times.'

11. Pagi thought it sufficient to say, for shewing the Constitutions not to be Clement's, that^a they are not mentioned among his works either by Eusebius or Jerom.

12. Le Clerc wrote a Dissertation, which he placed at the end of the second volume of his last edition of the Apostolical Fathers. He takes notice of^b some things in the Constitutions exceedingly unsuitable to the character of the apostles of Christ. He says, they^c well represent the ecclesiastical discipline of the fourth century; but^d not that of earlier times. He thinks,

^a Unde certissima mihi videtur sententia doctissimi Præfultis Pearsonii: qui in Vindictis S. Ignatii asseruit, octo libros Constitutionum post ævum Epiphani, sed ante Auctorem Operis Imperfecti in Matthæum compositos fuisse. Dicitur enim Auctor primus Constitutiones Apostolicas, tanquam pluribus libris constantes, citavit. — Hic itaque cum aliquamdiu post Theodosium Imp. vixerit, — octo libri Constitutionum exeunte sæculo iv. vel incunte v. prodierunt videntur. — Cæterum jam supra p. 43. admodum probabilem dixi conjecturam laudat Pearsoni — istam, qua modo utimur, καθολικῆς διδασκαλιᾶς, in octo libros digestam, ex variis διδασκαλίαις antiquioribus Apostolorum, Clementis, Ignatii, constata, hæcque maxima ex parte in illa conservata esse. Spic. p. 284, 285.

^x Histoire de l'Eglise, p. 488.

^y Ann. 100. n. 8, 9.

^z Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, p. 321.

^a Verum harum Constitutionum auctor non est Clemens Romanus, quia Eusebius, & Hieronymus libro de Scripturis Ecclesiasticis, cum de scriptis S. Clementis agunt, unam duntaxat illius ad Corinthios epistolam recensent. Legatur Eusebius, l. iii. c. 15. Pagi Ann. 100. n. 8.

^b Est in iis dogma quod maxime offendit viros doctos, & quidem merito, quo Episcopus ita extollitur, ut soli Deo subiciatur, utque Dynasta & Deus terrenus adpelletur. Quod veritati atque humilitati Apostolorum prorsus adversatur. Exstat, l. ii. c. 26. Rursus, cap. 34. sic loquuntur personati Apostoli de episcopis: — Hos Principes & Reges præesse existimate, tributæque eis offerre. &c. Diss. de Const. n. 6. p. 494.

^c Cæteroquin in Constitutionibus, quales habemus, optime describitur sæculi quarti disciplina ecclesiastica. Ib. n. 5. 1.

^d Est hic quoque tota disciplina ecclesiastica iv. sæculi, qualis ab initio non fuerat:

they

they were composed by some Arian of the fourth century: and seems to think, there may be some probability in the conjecture of another learned man, that they are the work of Leontius, bishop of Tripoli in Lydia.

13. Young Barratier published a Dissertation to shew, that the Constitutions were written in the second century, and not far below the beginning of it. He supposeth, that not long after the death of the apostles some person had a like design with that of Papias: he therefore collected what he could meet with of the apostle's precepts and sayings concerning Christian manners and worship. Nor did he confine himself to oral traditions: he also made use of divers books, some of them apocryphal; for which reasons many things may be here ascribed to the apostles which are not truly theirs. In some things the author may be relied upon; other things may be false and fictitious. So Barratier. I am unwilling to say, that this is a trifling hypothesis, and void of evidence: but it seems to me, that the Constitutions will be of little more use, or value, according to this opinion, than according to the opinion of those, who think them a collection made in the fourth or fifth century.

14. Mr. Whiston thinks, that the Apostolical Constitutions are the most sacred of the canonical books of the New Testament.

III. Such are the opinions of learned men concerning this work. I now intend to offer an argument upon it under the following heads.

ut jam observavit Jac. Usserius, Diff. cap. 14. 16. quem nemo confutavit, aut confutare queat. Ib. n. 10.

Ego vero Constitutiones, quales nunc habemus, cum etiamnum arderent contentiones Arianorum, ab episcopo quopiam Ariano conscriptas fuisse clanculum ut earum auctoritate, ad confirmandam Arianam doctrinam, uteretur, & quidem ante quarti seculi finem, existimo. Ib. n. 5.

qualis erat Leontius Tripolitanus, in Lydia, episcopus: si ereditur iudicio viri doctissimi, Thomæ Brunonis, quod in hoc ipso volumine edidimus. Ib. n. 3.

Itaque Apostolis defunctis, probabile est, pios quosdam viros conatos esse omnia eorum dicta, facta, & scripta, colligere, & posteritati servare. Sic Papias. Sic tot apocryphorum auctores. Inde statim post A. C. centesimum aliquis conatus fuerit omnia colligere, quæ Apostoli circa mores et ritus Christianorum reliquerint. Et sane Constitutiones ex variis collectas esse trætati-

tibus manifestum est.—Interim nolo idcirco omnia et singula, quo in Constitutionibus leguntur, Apostolis tribuere. Multa iis supposita esse nullo negotio credo. Et sane illis temporibus tam ingens librorum apocryphorum, dubiorum, &c. numerus ortus est, ut fieri non possit, Constitutionum compilatorem, non ex iis quædam in opus suum irrepere passum esse.—In iis factis historicis, quæ nude referantur, et non nexus causa adhibita sunt, aio Constitutiones omnem fidem mereri.—Sed alia ratio est, de conventu v. gr. omnium Apostolorum, qui modo ideo fictus est, ut iis tribuerentur Constitutiones, tanquam commune opus. Alia ratio iterum de Simonis Magi historia, quæ potuit ficta esse, quia credebatur interesse Apostolorum, ut multa prodigia iis tribuerentur, et multa hæreticis falsa affingerentur. Barrat. Disquis. Chronol. p. 282, 283. Ultrajecti. 1740. 4to.

See the second and third volumes of Primitive Christianity revived.

1. I shall observe some passages, in which the apostles are mentioned as authors.

2. We will inquire, what right this work has to the names of the apostles: where will be considered both external and internal evidence.

3. If it should appear that their authority is made use of without reason, it will follow, that the work is an imposture.

IV. In the first place we are to observe some of the passages, in which the apostles are mentioned as authors.

1. And indeed these eight books of Constitutions are written, and the things contained in them are delivered, as in the name of the apostles of Jesus Christ.

2. They begin with this inscription, or salutation: 'The apostles and elders to all, who from among the Gentiles have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace and peace be multiplied unto you from God Almighty, through our Lord Jesus Christ, in the acknowledgement of him.'

3. 'Wherefore^k we the twelve apostles of the Lord, who are now together, send you these our divine Constitutions, concerning every ecclesiastical form, there being present with us also the chosen vessel, our fellow-apostle Paul, and the rest of the elders, and the seven deacons.'

4. That quotation is from the fourth chapter of the eighth and last book. And in the last chapter of it, again: 'Now^l this we all in common charge you, that every one remain in the rank assigned him, without transgressing the appointed bounds. For they are not ours, but God's.'

5. And still lower, in the same chapter, near the conclusion of the whole work: 'As by Moses were appointed high-priests, priests and Levites, and by our Saviour we the thirteen were appointed: and by the apostles I James, and I Clement, and others, not to name them again: and by all in common presbyters, deacons, sub-deacons, and readers...'

6. It appears, then, that the whole of the work, and all the ordinances in it, from beginning to end, are delivered in the name of all Christ's apostles, and as from God himself.

7. These Constitutions assume not only the names of the apostles, but also their characters and actions.

8. 'And^m to take our own things,' say they, 'Judas our companion had part with us in the same ministry.'

^l Οι αποστολοι και οι πρεσβυτεροι πασι τοις εκ εθλων πιστευουσαι. κ. λ. Const. Proem. in. ^k Αμα τοις υπαρχουσιν ημεις οι δεκαδυσ τα κυρια αποστολοι τας δε τας διδας ημων ανιλλομεθα διαλαζει. L. viii. c. 4. in. ^l Επειτα δε κοινη παλις παραγγελιομεν. L. viii. c. 46. in. ^m L. ii. c. 14. p. 222. m.

p. 340.

9. 'I Matthew', one of the twelve, who speak to you in this doctrine, was a publican.'

10. 'So' the Lord was not ashamed of me Matthew, though before I was a publican. And he received Peter, and made him shepherd of his own sheep, after he had through fear denied him thrice. And he appointed Paul to be our fellow-apostle, who before had been a persecutor.'

11. 'For' taking a towel, he girded himself; and then put water in a basin, and came round to us, as we sat, and washed all our feet, and wiped them with the towel.'

12. 'And' on the fifth day of the week, when we had eaten the passover with him,—he delivered to us the representative mysteries of his precious body and blood, Judas not being present with us.—He went out to the mount of Olives—and we were with him, and sang an hymn according to custom.'

13. 'For' our Lord and Master Jesus Christ sent us twelve to teach the nations. There were with us Mary the mother of the Lord, and Mary Magdalene, and what follows.'

14. 'And' after eight days he gave me Thomas, who was hard of belief concerning his resurrection, full assurance, shewing me the print of the nails, and the wound made in his side by the spear.'

15. 'On the' day of Pentecost, at the third hour of the day, the Lord Jesus sent down upon us the gift of the Holy Ghost: and we were filled with power, and spake with new tongues, as the Spirit enabled us; and we preached to Jews and Gentiles, that Jesus is the Christ.'

16. 'For' we also, for Christ's sake, were often beaten by Caiaphas, and Alexander, and Annas; and went out rejoicing, that we were accounted worthy to suffer such things for our Saviour.' See Acts iv. 6. v. 40, 41.

17. Having mentioned divers parts of our Lord's history, they add: 'All' these things we testify of him, who did eat and drink with him, and were eye-witnesses of his wonderful works, of his words, and sufferings, and death, and resurrection from the dead, after which also we conversed with him forty days. And what follows.' Much more may be seen elsewhere.

^a L. ii. c. 39.

^b L. ii. c. 24. p.

^c L. v. c. 19. p. 324.

^d L. v. c.

^e L. iii. c. 19. p. 290.

^f L. v. c. 2.

^g L. v. c. 14. p. 317.

^h L. iii. c.

ⁱ L. v. c. 7. p. 309.

^j See l. v.

^k Ibid. infr.

^l Ibid. infr.

^m c. 14. throughout, and l. ii. c. 55.

18. That they take upon them the character of the apostles, appears also in the names of the persons, whom they speak of as their assistants and companions; all well known to have been companions of Christ's apostles, or some of them.

19. 'These things' we send unto you by our fellow-servant, and most faithful and unanimous son in the Lord, Clement, together with Barnabas, and our most faithful son Timothy, and our own son Mark; together with whom we recommend to you Titus, and Luke, and Jason, and Sosipater.'

20. In the twelfth chapter of the eighth book is a constitution, or order of James, the brother of John, and son of Zebedee. In the thirty-third chapter of the same book is a constitution of Paul and Peter. In the thirty-fifth chapter is a constitution of James the brother of the Lord, and bishop of Jerusalem. Not to mention other things of that kind.

21. These Constitutions therefore are not written or composed, or drawn up by Clement, but by the apostles: they are only sent by him. Thus at the beginning of the sixteenth chapter of the sixth book: 'All^b these things we have sent, [or written] to you, that ye may know what our opinion is.' And in the eighteenth chapter of the same book, partly cited above: 'This^c catholic doctrine we have left to you bishops, and others, for the establishment of them that believe; and have sent it to you by our faithful fellow-minister Clement.' He also speaks, together with James, in a place before cited. But the whole work, and all the Constitutions in general are drawn up in the name of the apostles, or of them and their assistants; as appears from the many passages that have been transcribed.

22. These Constitutions then, as we have seen, are written in the name of the apostles: and according to the whole tenor of the work, they are rightly termed apostolical.

V. Let us now inquire into the justness of this claim.

1. As the work now before us bears the title of Apostolical Constitutions, and is written in the name of the apostles, as we have sufficiently seen; we are led to inquire, what notice has been taken of it in the genuine, uncontroverted works of ancient Christian writers: and then to compare the Constitutions themselves, and other things occasionally mentioned in this work, with the generally received writings of the apostles, and likewise with the doctrines and customs of the early times

^a L. vi. c. 18. p. 349.

πάντα ἐπεστάλαμεν ὑμῖν.

ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν — τὴν δὲ τὴν καθολικὴν διδασ-

^b Ταῦτα

καλῶς — διαπεμφθῆμενοι διὰ τοῦ συλλέ-

^c Καταλι-

τῆς ἡμῶν κλημῆτος. P. 349.

of the church, so far as we are acquainted with them. In both these ways the Apostolical Constitutions have been largely considered by ^d Daillé, and since by ^e Mr. Robert Turner.

2. Daillé examined all the several ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Dionysius, and Peter of Alexandria, and some others; and has shewn, as it seems to me, with great probability, that the Constitutions were unknown to all those writers. Mr. Turner has again gone over all the same authors, and some others omitted by Daillé; and he could not find in them the Apostolical Constitutions any more than Daillé. To those and other learned writers I refer. I shall, however, observe some things briefly.

3. In these ^f Constitutions is a long history of Simon Magus. Divers other heretics are particularly mentioned: Cleobius, Dositheus, the Ebionites, Cerinthus, Marc, Menander, Basilides, Saturninus, the Nicolaitans, and Hemerobaptists. The evil of heresies is shewn; the causes of them are assigned and enumerated; they are condemned and confuted. Nevertheless, no notice is taken of all this by Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, or Eusebius; no, nor by Epiphanius, as before observed: though it would have been very much to their purpose. In short, they could not have omitted it in their censures of the ancient heresies, or in their arguments against them, if they had been acquainted with it: for, certainly, the express authority of the apostles would have been of great advantage to them.

4. With regard to Clement of Alexandria, Daillé says, that ^g he quotes Clement of Rome, and Barnabas, and other Christian authors. He had also many occasions to quote the Constitutions, if he had been acquainted with them, as Daillé clearly shews: but yet he takes not any the least notice of them.

5. Another thing relating to Clement of Alexandria, well observed by ^h Mr. Turner, is; that ⁱ the Constitutions absolutely forbid the reading of heathen authors. Nevertheless Clement, who was himself a man of prodigious reading, and a great master of heathen learning, frequently quotes in his works all sorts of authors; and has recommended ^k the reading of heathen authors, and the study of philosophy: which he would

^d Joannis Dallæi de Pseudepigraphis Apostolicis libri iii. Hardervici. 1653.

^e Discourse of the pretended Apostolical Constitutions. London. 1715.

^f Vid. lib. 6. cap. 4—11.

Dall. ib. p. 268, 269.

^g Vid. p. 93, 94.

ⁱ Τὸν ἰθὺν καὶ βιβλίον παλιν ἀπὸ τοῦ.

L. i. c. 6. in.

^k Vid. Strom. l. i.

not have done, if he had been acquainted with these Constitutions, and had acknowledged them to be Apostolical.

6. Mr. Turner adds, Clement of Alexandria was not singular in this. Tertullian, Origen, and a great many more, justify and recommend the reading of heathen compositions: and though St. Jerom (as we are told) was whipped for it, yet it was never said to be, because he had broken an apostolical constitution.

7. And says the ingenious¹ Mr. Brekell: The Constitutions prohibit the reading of heathen authors: and yet many of the ancient fathers, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and others, recommend the reading of such books; a plain proof, that they knew of no such Apostolical Constitution. Besides, if this had been a Constitution of the Christian church, the emperor Julian would have had no occasion to make the same prohibition.

8. There was^m a dispute in the third century between Stephen bishop of Rome, and Cyprian bishop of Carthage, concerning the method of receiving such as came over from heretics. Cyprian and other African bishops said, the baptism of heretics was null and void, and therefore they who came over from them were to be baptized. Stephen, on the contrary, allowed the validity of their baptism; and was for receiving such as came over from them with imposition of hands only. This point is decided inⁿ our Constitutions, agreeably to the judgment of Cyprian, and his African colleagues: yet nobody then appealed to this work, or took any notice of it. Probably therefore it was not extant at that time.

9. I shall mention a particular relating to Origen, not generally taken notice of. In his books against Celsus he says, that^o James and John, Andrew and Peter, were fishermen, and Matthew a publican. But in what way the rest of Christ's disciples subsisted, before they followed him, was not known. But the apostles in the Constitutions say: 'Though^p we are employed in preaching the gospel, we do not omit working. For some of us are fishermen, others tentmakers, others husbandmen.' Certainly Origen knew nothing of this. And Cotelerius, in his notes upon the Constitutions says, We^q

¹ See Divine Oracles, p. 116.

^m See Turner, as before, p. 122—130.

And in this work, Vol. iii. ch. 43. n. 6.

^p 69—71. and ch. 44. p. 137.

ⁿ Vid. Const. lib. vi. cap. 15.

^o Των δὲ λοιπῶν ἢ μεταβηκαίμεν τὰ ἔργα, εἴτε πρὸς τῆς μαθητείας τῆς Ἰησοῦ περιποιεῖται

αὐτοῖς τὰς τροφάς. Cont. Cels. l. i. p. 48. Cant. p. 376. Bened. p. —

γὰρ εἰσὶν ἐξ ἡμῶν ἀλιεῖς, οἱ δὲ σκηνοποιεῖ, οἱ δὲ γῆς ἐργάται. L. ii. cap. 63.

^q Sed tenendum omnino est cum Origene jam laudato, præter quatuor supra memoratos, et unum Publicanum, Mat-

p. 350.

are to abide by Origen. There is no certain knowledge, what occupations the rest of the twelve followed, beside those mentioned by him.

10. That the ^a Constitutions were unknown to the learned Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria about the year 248, is apparent. Basilides, a friend of his, wrote ^a a letter to him, desiring his opinion upon some points. Dionysius's letter ^a is still extant. In answer to one of the queries put by Basilides, concerning the duration of the antepaschal fast, he says, it is difficult to determine. Nevertheless, the point is clearly determined ^a in our Apostolical Constitutions. And of another question put by Basilides, he gives a solution quite contrary to ^a our Constitutions: and in the conclusion of the letter, he leaves his friend to judge for himself as he sees best. This must be reckoned full proof, that Dionysius was altogether unacquainted with our Apostolical Constitutions.

11. There was a controversy about the time of keeping Easter, which began ^a in the second century, and lasted ^a until the sitting of the council of Nice: yet none appealed to the Constitutions about it. Those cited by Epiphanius determine in favour of one side; ours in favour of the other. But that neither of those Constitutions was then extant, or received as Apostolical, is manifest: for if there had been an Apostolical Constitution about it, the controversy had been ended, or rather could not have been.

12. Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, speaking of this matter says: the apostles had left it indifferent to every body: that ^a neither Christ, nor his apostles, had appointed an annual festival for celebrating the memory of his passion. And speaking of the several opinions about the duration and manner of the antepaschal fast, he says, that ^b none of them were able to allege any written order about it. Consequently, Socrates likewise either knew nothing of our Constitutions, or did not esteem them Apostolical.

13. Eusebius of Cæsarea is concerned in several things already mentioned. In his accounts of early heretics, of the

thzum, ignorari qua ex arte victum sibi comparant reliqui ex duodecim, antequam a Christo essent vocati.

^a See before, Vol. iii. p. 191—193.

^b See before, Vol. iii. p. 95.

^c Ap. Labb. Cont. T. i. p. 832.

^d Vid. l. v. c. 28, 19, 21.

^e L. vi. c. 27, 28.

^f See before in this work, Vol. ii. ch. 2, and ch. 28. p. 304—306.

^g Vid. Euseb. Vit. Const. l. iii. cap. 5.

^a Αλλα την ιερην τε πασχα και τας αλλας ιεριας τιμας τη ευσωμοσυνη των ευαγγελιστων και ιεροποιων. Socr. l. v. c. 21. p. 283. C.

Ου γαρ νομω της παραφυλαττης ο σωτηρ η οι αποστολοι παραγγειλαν. Ib. D.

^b Και επιιδαν εδεις περι της εγγραφης εχει δεξαι παραγγελμα, δηλον, ως και περι της τη εκαστη γινωμη και προαιρεσει επι της ος αποστολοι κ. λ. Ib. p. 286. C.

disputes

disputes about Easter, and other matters, he says nothing of the Constitutions; though they might have been very properly mentioned, if in being, and he had been acquainted with them. Consequently they were unknown to him. There is however one particular which may be distinctly mentioned. Our Constitutions say, that^c the first bishops of Cæsarea in Palestine were Zaccheus the publican, Cornelius, and Theophilus: meaning, probably, him to whom St. Luke had addressed both his Gospel and his Acts. Nevertheless, Eusebius nowhere takes^d notice of these honourable predecessors of his in the see of Cæsarea.

14. We need not particularly examine later writers: for, as Daillé says, if^e the Constitutions were not Apostolical in the first three centuries, all the wit and industry of later ages cannot make them so. But if we should call up and examine Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Chrysostom, the Cyrils of Jerusalem and Alexandria, Jerom and Augustine, and all the other eminent Christian writers of the fourth, and the former part of the fifth century, they would be all silent. They give no intelligence concerning the Apostolical Constitutions: they have not quoted them, or mentioned them, in any of their writings. Jerom in particular, who in his Catalogue of Illustrious Men, has distinct articles for all the writers of the New Testament, and for Clement Bishop of Rome, mentions not any work of theirs called Constitutions, or Apostolical Constitutions. Certainly this must be sufficient to satisfy us of the non-existence, or vast obscurity of the Apostolical Constitutions in the early days of Christianity.

15. The first who has mentioned them, excepting Epiphanius, and the first of all, who has mentioned them as divided into several books, is^f the author of the Imperfect Work upon St. Matthew, probably^g a Latin writer, and plainly an Arian, who wrote some time after the reign of Theodosius the great: how long after it cannot be determined. But there is as much reason to think, he did not write till after the end of the fifth century, as that he wrote sooner.

^c L. vii. c. 46. in. p. 382.
^d V. pseudo-Clementis apocryphos libros aut non legit, aut potius lectos sprexit Eusebius Cæsariensis: alias tanta ecclesie sue ornamenta nequaquam in operibus suis omisurus. Cot. in loc.
^e Nam si primis tribus Christianismi seculis Apostolicæ non fuerunt Bovianæ illæ *ὑποτάξεις*,

nemo non videt nulla sequentium temporum vel auctoritate vel industria fieri eas apostolicas posse. De Pseudep. p. 321.

^f Vid. Veterum Testimonia de Constitut. Ap. ap. Patr. Ap. T. i. ^g Vid. Montfaucon. Diatriba ad Op. Imp. in Matt. ap. Chrysost. opp. T. 6. ed. Bened.

16. Consequently, the Constitutions are destitute of all external evidence, that should entitle them to the character of Apostolical.

VI. I proceed to the internal evidence. Here I shall mention divers things, marks of a later age than that of the apostles, and unsuitable to their character: at the same time willingly omitting many other things, for the sake of brevity, and supposing it not necessary to be more particular.

1. The manner of quoting the books of the New Testament in this work does not suit the apostles, as, I think, every one may perceive.

1.) 'Christ^a says in the gospel.' [Matt. v. 27.]

2.) 'Inⁱ the like manner it is written also in the gospel.' [Luke vi. 28.] And presently afterwards: 'Again^k he says in the gospel.' [Matt. v. 44, 45.]

3.) 'The^l Lord often says in the gospel reminding men: *He that has ears to hear, let him hear.*'

4.) 'For^m our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ says in the gospels.' [Matt. v. 23, 24.]

5.) 'Concerningⁿ this the Lord declared, saying:—And again he says to his disciples, even to us, thus: Where are quoted Matt. x 33, 37, 38, 39. and xvi. 22. and x. 28.

6.) Having given an account of the circumstances of our Lord's being betrayed, and of his crucifixion and resurrection, it is added, 'All^o these things also are written in the gospels.'

7.) Let^p a bishop be knowing, and studying the Lord's books, that he may rightly explain the scriptures:—that the interpretations of the law and the prophets may correspond with the gospel. For the Lord Jesus says: *Search the scriptures. For these are they which testify of me.* And again: *For Moses wrote of me.* [John v. 39. 46.] Certainly, this order was not given until after St. John's gospel was written and published, probably not until after all the Lord's books, or scriptures of the New Testament, had been written, and put into the hands of Christians.

8. Daillé did not^q overlook this argument.

^a Λέγει γὰρ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. L. i. c. 1.

ⁱ Ομοίως καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γεγραπταί. L. i. c. v.

^k Ibid.

^l Καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ μνημονεύει. — L. ii. c. 6. p. 217. f.

^m Λέγει δὲ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σήμερον Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ. L. ii. c. 53. p. 258. in.

ⁿ L. v. cap. 4. p. 303.

^o Τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γεγραπταί. L. v. c. 14.

fin.

^p — πολυδιδάκτος, μετέωρος καὶ σπουδαζὼν ἐν ταῖς κυριακαῖς βιβλοῖς. — x. x. L. ii. cap. 5.

^q Cum ergo nostri Διατάξεις iis temporibus & vixerint, & congregati fuerint, quibus Joannis Evangelium editum erat, — clarum est, fieri nequaquam posse, ut Διατάξεις Christi Apostoli vere sint. De Pseudep. Ap. L. i. c. 14. p. 168. Vid. & p. 169. 186.

9.) I add no more here: but several things of a like kind will occur in a following article, concerning this writer's testimony to the scriptures. There will be seen a Constitution about the method of ordaining bishops, expressly said to be a Constitution of the Twelve, and Paul, and the seven deacons: wherein it is appointed, that the gospels should be held over the head of the bishop to be ordained, or just ordained. But how was it possible that all the apostles, and all the seven deacons, should join in such a Constitution? Did none of the apostles or deacons die before the publication of the gospels? Were all the gospels written before the death of James, son of Zebedee, and brother of John, and before the martyrdom of Stephen? None will say it. The reader is also desired to observe the first quotation in that article, and to consider whether all the apostles could join in appointing the reading of the Acts? which, certainly, were not written till after the sixtieth year of our Lord's nativity.

2. I proceed to other things later than the time of the apostles.

1.) It cannot be shewn, that the several heretics above-mentioned had appeared before the end of the apostolical age. Moreover they are here said, to have 'published wicked books in the names of the apostles: calumniating the creation of God, and marriage, the law and the prophets; which cannot be shewn to have been done before the death of the apostles.

2.) There are many things in these books, which seem to shew, that the reign of heathenism in the Roman empire was over, and that Christians enjoyed ease and prosperity.

3.) 'Nor' does the Lord desire, that the law of righteousness should be made manifest by us only, say the apostles here. It has also been his good pleasure, that it should appear and shine by means of the Romans: for they also have believed in the Lord, and have forsaken polytheism and unrighteousness; and they cherish the good, and punish the bad.' Cotelerius in his notes says: certainly 'this could not be said by the apostles. And if it could be made out, that it might be truly said, at some season before there were Christian emperors, [which cannot be easily done:] it would not be very material.

* Καὶ τὰ ἐπ' ὀνόματι ἡμῶν παρὰ τῶν ἀπείρων κραυγὴν βιβλία ἢ παραδίδω-
ται. κ. λ. L. vi. c. 16. in.

Τοιαῦτα καὶ νῦν ποιοῦσιν οἱ διττωνόμοι,
διακαλλοῦσι δὴμιοφίαν, γάμον, — νόμον,
ᾠροφίαν. Eod. cap. sub fin.

* L. vi. cap. 24.

† Certum ac manifestum est, non potuisse hæc ab apostolis scribi. Sed an deduci debeant usque ad tempora imperatorum Christianorum, id vero, ut parvi momenti, ita ambiguum, obscurumque mihi videtur. Cot. in loc.

like kind
er's testi-
stitution
d to be a
deacons:
held over
ed. But
ven dea-
e of the
the gos-
f James,
he mar-
also de-
to con-
ing the
tten till
apostles.
above-
cal age.
d books
tion of
cannot
les.
eem to
ire was
ateous-
postles
ld ap-
b have
d un-
sh the
ld not
that it
ristian
ot be

trum ac
aposto-
que ad
um, id
guam,
loc.

The

4.) The ease and prosperity of Christians appear in the description that is given of a church. 'Let^a the building be oblong, pointing eastward, with vestries on each side at the east end, that it may be like a ship: let the bishop's throne be placed in the middle: on each side of him [or that] let the presbyters sit: let the deacons stand near in short and light garments: let the reader stand upon an eminence.' And what follows.

5.) In another place and book: 'When^a this is done, let the deacons bring the gifts to the bishop at the altar; and let the presbyters stand on his right hand, and on his left, as disciples stand before their master: and let two deacons on each side the altar hold a fan made of thin membranes, or of the feathers of a peacock, or of fine cloth; and let them silently keep off the small animals that fly about, that they may not get into the cups. Let the high priest, therefore, with the priests, pray by himself, and being clothed with his splendid garment, and standing at the altar, let him make the sign of the cross with his hand upon his forehead before all the people.' And what follows. This is particularly said to be a Constitution of James the brother of John, and son of Zebedee. But who can think, that such state and grandeur were brought into the church in his time, who was beheaded by Herod Agrippa within ten or twelve years after our Lord's ascension? Yea, who can think, that such a method of celebrating the eucharist was introduced in the time of any of Christ's apostles?

6.) I might likewise object to the style of this, and many other passages of this work. For it cannot be shewn, that the Christian writers of the apostolical age, or soon after it, called Christian Ministers, 'high priests,' or 'priests,' or 'Levites:' nor that they called the communion-table 'the altar.' Moreover it is now generally allowed, that^a in the first and second centuries, Christians had not any regular or spacious buildings to meet in.

7.) Another Constitution, shewing the church to be at ease, is this: 'When^a you teach the people, O bishop, command

^a L. ii. c. 57. p. 261.

^x L. viii.

^y Ac sane germana virorum apostolicorum scripta, Clementis scilicet, Polycarpi, Iuliani, vocabula pontificis, sacerdotum, Levitarum, Christiano clero significando numquam usurparunt. Neque magis Clementinæ ætatis est vocabulum ἑστιάριον, altare, ad eucharistiæ

mensam indicandam. Basnag. Ann. 100. n. xii.

^z — οἱ μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων, οἱ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐκομα μὲν χάρισμασι πνευματικοῖς, εἶρου δὲ παλίσια λαμπρά ἐκκλησιαστικά καὶ ἡ. καὶ λ. Ibid. Pelus. Ep. l. ii. n. 246. At forte sic legendum: οἱ — εἶρου δὲ παλίσια, λαμπρά ἐκκλησιαστικά καὶ ἡ.

^a L. ii. c. 59.

‘ them to come to church morning and evening every day—
 ‘ do you assemble yourselves together every day, morning
 ‘ and evening, singing psalms, and praying in the Lord’s
 ‘ house.—But especially on the sabbath-day, and on the Lord’s-
 ‘ day, do you meet together more diligently.’

8.) Again: I^b Paul and I Peter ordain as follows: Let
 ‘ slaves [or servants] work six days; but on the sabbath-day,
 ‘ and the Lord’s-day, let them have leisure to go to church
 ‘ to be instructed in religion.—And in the whole great week,
 ‘ and in that which follows, let servants cease from work;
 ‘ because that is the week of Christ’s passion, this of his resur-
 ‘ rection. Let them also rest on the day of Christ’s ascension,
 ‘ because it is the conclusion of the dispensation by Christ.
 ‘ Let them rest on Pentecost, because of the coming of the
 ‘ Spirit which was given to believers. Let them also rest
 ‘ from labour on the feast of the Nativity, and on the day of
 ‘ Epiphany. Let them also rest on the days of the apostles,
 ‘ and the day of Stephen the protomartyr, and on the days of
 ‘ other martyrs, who loved Jesus Christ above their own lives.’

9.) Possibly some may (though without reason) pretend, or
 suspect, that the latter part of this Constitution is an interpo-
 lation. I therefore now insist only on the former part of it,
 so far as relates to servants resting on the ‘ sabbath-day, Lord’s-
 ‘ day, the great week, and the week following, and the day
 ‘ of Christ’s ascension, and the day of Pentecost.’ And it
 seems to me, that neither Peter, nor Paul, nor any of the
 apostles, could deliver such Constitutions relating to slaves or
 servants: such rules could not be proposed in the time of the
 apostles, and at the first planting of the Christian religion in
 the world. By the Roman laws servants were as much the
 property of their masters, as any other part of their estate:
 they could use them as they pleased; and had the power of
 life and death till the time of Antoninus the pious, who, by
 his constitution, restrained or abrogated it. For it is there
 said: *Qui sine causa servum suum occiderit, non minus puniri*
jubetur, quam si servum alienum occiderit. Inst. l. i. tit. 8.
De his, qui sui, vel alieni juris sunt. Or, if we may credit
 Spartian, this had been done by his immediate predecessor
 Adrian. His words are these: *Servos a dominis occidi vetuit,*
& jussit damnari per judices, si digni essent, Spart. in vit.
 Adrian. cap. 18. But as those laws were not made till after
 the times of the apostles, nothing can be more absurd, than

^b L. viii. c. 33.

to in
 woul
 besid
 judic
 temp
 more
 their
 the a
 Paul
 the y
 name
 10.
 or co
 court
 deaco
 obser
 empe

11.
 either
 shews
 of th
 trine
 know
 ries,
 and f
 pointe
 them
 aposto
 of wi
 purpo
 ment,
 Socrat
 percei
 in any
 have a

‘ Ta
 cascia
 ‘ Den
 planam
 quod m
 principu
 auctorita
 supr. p.
 19. l. vii
 6. Gal.
 4. Jeju

to imagine they would lay any such injunction upon slaves, as would deprive their masters two days in seven of their labour, beside other occasional days. Nothing could have more prejudiced them against the Christian religion, than such an attempt upon their property: nor could any thing have been more cruel to slaves, many of whom must doubtless have lost their lives, had they complied with any such Constitution of the apostles: and it may be reckoned contrary to what St. Paul enjoins 1 Tim. vi. 1. *Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed.*

10.) Christian bishops are here supposed to have tribunals, or courts of judicature. They^c are directed to hold their courts on the second day of the week, or Monday; and the deacons and presbyters are to be present: that is, as Daillé^d observes, here is reference to a privilege allowed by Christian emperors, not till long after the death of the Apostles.

11.) The great^e number of days distinguished and appointed either for fasts or feasts, (as we partly saw in a late quotation) shews this work of the Constitutions to be later than the times of the apostles. These appointments are contrary to the doctrine of Paul in^f his well known epistles, and also to the well known practice of the church in the second and third centuries. The Christians had in early times some days of fasting and feasting, but they were not so numerous as those here appointed; nor were they unanimous in the manner of keeping them; nor do they seem generally to have thought them of apostolical appointment, but rather, as Jerom says, ^g counsels of wise men, or institutions answering some good ends and purposes. That all did not think them of apostolical appointment, may be reckoned very probable from the judgment of Socrates formerly taken notice of. Augustine declares: I^h perceive, the gospel teaches us to fast; but I do not see, that in any part of the New Testament, either Christ or his apostles have appointed on what days we should fast, and on what not

^c Τα δὲ δικαστήρια ὑμῶν γίνεσθω δευτέρα σαββάτων. κ. λ. L. ii. c. 47. in.

^d Denique rem totam sic describunt, ut planum sit, nihil aliud eos intellexisse, quam quod multis post apostolos temporibus principum Christianorum benignitate atque auctoritate episcopis indultum fuit. Ubi supr. p. 319.

^e Vid. I. v. c. 17 —

^f See Rom. xiv.

^g Gal. iv. 10. Col. ii. 15. 16.

^h Jejunia & congregationes inter dies

propter eos a viris prudentibus constitutos, qui magis seculo vacent quam Deo. Hieron. in Galat. iv. 10.

^h Ego in evangelicis & apostolis literis, totoque instrumento, quod appellatur Testamentum Novum, animo id revolvens, video præceptum esse jejunium. Quibus autem diebus non oporteat jejunare, & quibus oporteat, præcepto Domini vel apostolorum, non inveni definitum. Ad Casul. ep. 36. al. 76. cap. xi. T. 2.

to fast. And Tertullian represents the ¹ catholic doctrine of his time about fasts much in the same manner. As for festivals, Origen in the third century mentions but ^k three, Lord's-days, Easter, and Pentecost. I hope I need not enlarge here; but I refer to ^l Daillé and ^m Turner, who have fully considered the point. And Daillé having summarily ⁿ enumerated the fasts and feasts of the Constitutions, and put down their assertion, 'that every one is guilty of sin, who fasts on the ^o Lord's-day, or the day of Pentecost, or, in a word, on any ^p festival of the Lord,' says very well, that the Constitutions, which have distinguished almost every day in the year, either as a fast or a feast, could not come from the apostles of Christ. Indeed the great apostle Paul says to the Colossians, ch. ii. 16. and in them, I suppose, to all Christians in general, *Let no man judge you in meat, or drink, or in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths.* But these apostles [whether false apostles, or true, let any man determine], make no scruple of judging men on such accounts.

12.) Before I quite leave this point, I would take some particular notice of the respect shewn in these Constitutions for the sabbath, or seventh day of the week.

They ordain, that by ^o all Christians in general, the sabbath and the Lord's-day should be kept as festivals: that ^p every sabbath in the year, except one, and every Lord's-day, be kept with joy, without making them days of mourning, or fasting: that servants ^q should cease from labour, and come to

ⁱ Itaque de cætero differenter jejundum ex arbitrio, non ex imperio disciplinæ, pro temporibus & causis uniuscujusque. Sic & apostolos observasse, nullum aliud imponentes jugum certorum & in commune omnibus obcundorum juniorum. De Jejun. cap. 2. p. 702. A.

^k Εὰν δὲ τις πρὸς ταῦτα ἀνθυποφέρνη ταῦτα τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν κυριακῶν, ἢ παρασκευῶν, ἢ τῆς Πασχα, ἢ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς. Contr. Cell. 8. p. 758. F. Bened.

^l Vid. de Pseudep. Ap. l. i. cap. x. xi.

^m As before, p. 242—258. ⁿ Cum hoc vero et indubitato apostolorum dogmate equidem non video, qui conciliari possint illæ tam multæ de perpetuis certorum dierum, aut jejunii, aut non jejunii leges. Illi enim & hebdomadam quidem antepaschalem, & quadragesimam, & quartam sextamque cujusvis hebdomadis ferias ab omnibus Christianis jejunari lege in perpetuum lata præcipiunt. Altera vero ex parte tum sabbatum, tum Dominicam diem, & omnes quinquaginta a

Paschate ad Pentecostem dies, adhuc Natalis Dominici diem, &c. — hos, inquam, omnes dies jejunio funestari vetant, & si quis uno ex iis jejunarit, eum deliquisse, piaculumque committere pronunciant. L. v. c. xx. fin.

^o Εὐχοχὸς γὰρ ἀμαρτίας ἡμεῖς τῆς κυριακῆς ἡμεῖς, — ἡ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς. — Mitto rei ipsius absurditatem, atque ineptiam. — Hoc unum dico, nihil minus illos esse, quam Christi apostolos, qui omnem fere totius anni diem vel jejunii morori, vel prandii lætitiæ addicunt, ac mancipant. &c. Dall. de Pseud. l. i. c. xi. p. 141, 142.

^p Το σαββατοῦ μὴδὲ καὶ τῆς κυριακῆς ἐσθλαζέσθαι. L. vii. c. 23. p. 369.

^q Πᾶς μὲν τοι σαββατοῦ, ἀνὴρ τὸ ἡμέραν, καὶ πᾶσαν κυριακὴν ἐπιστάλῃς συνόδου ὀφραϊσθῆναι. x. λ. L. v. cap. 20. p. 387. Vid. & l. vii. c. 36. in. p. 376.

^r Σαββατοῦ δὲ καὶ κυριακῆς σφραγίσαν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, διὰ τῆς ἀδυναμίας τῆς ἐκκλησίας. L. viii. c. 33. in. p. 414.

church on the sabbath, and the Lord's-day : that * Christians in general should assemble together for worship on every day, but especially on the sabbath, and the Lord's-day.

Concerning these particulars I would say, that the apostles of Christ never gave such instructions about keeping the sabbath. Secondly, that they are more suitable to the fourth or fifth centuries, than to the most early times of Christianity.

First, the apostles of Christ never gave such instructions about keeping the sabbath. That the apostles did not appoint the keeping of the sabbath as a feast, and forbid fasting thereon, is evident hence, that Christians in general never reckoned themselves bound by any such rule. This will appear from observations of Petavius, which * I place below : to which I shall add a passage from * a letter of St. Jerom.

That the apostles did not require servants, or other Christians, to cease from labour on the sabbath, is shewn * by some following observations of the learned writer just cited. He particularly takes notice, that the council of Laodicea forbids Christians to esteem the sabbath a day of rest from labour.

Secondly, these instructions about keeping the sabbath, are more suitable to the fourth or fifth century, than to the most early times of Christianity.

* — μαλιστα δὲ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῷ σαββάτῳ, καὶ ἐν τῇ τῇ κυρίῳ ἀναστάσιμῳ τῇ κυριακῇ, σπουδαίοντως ἀπαίσια. L. ii. c. 39. p. 268.

* Non enim ubique, nec in tota ecclesia, sabbatum jejunii expers fuit. Etenim Romani, quod Socrates lib. v. cap. xxii. scripsit, παν σαββατον νηστεύουσι. Deo quo fulsissime Augustinus ep. 86. & 118. [al. 36. ad Casulan. & 54. ad Januar.] Quare nulla est ab apostolis edita sanctio, qua jejunium eo die prohiberetur, uti Augustinus asserit in ep. 118. ubi in rebus hujusmodi negat quicquam esse * vel * scripturæ sanctæ auctoritate, vel universæ ecclesiæ traditione determinatum.

Qua quidem præscriptione tanquam spurius & alienus canon ille rejicitur, qui inter apostolicos 68. numeratur : Εἰ τις κληρικὸς ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ νηστεύῃ, ἢ το σαββάτῳ, πλὴν τῶ ἐνός μόνου, καθαιρεῖσθω * εἰ δὲ λαϊκός, ἀφοριεῖσθω. Non potest hoc ab apostolis communi esse decreto constitutum — Nec melioris notæ sunt, quæ in Apost. Constit. leguntur l. vii. c. 28. [sec. 23.] ubi τὰ σαββατά, καὶ τὰς κυριακάς ἐστὶν ἀπαίσια. Quod ab apostolis toti ecclesiæ nunquam esse præscriptum, sanctissimorum Patrum consensu approbavit Petav. Animadv. in Epiphani. p. 359.

* De Sabbatho quod quaeris, utrum jejunandum sit. — Sed ego illud breviter te admonendum puto, traditiones ecclesiasticas (præsertim quæ fidei non officiant) ita observandas, ut a majoribus traditæ sunt.

— Atque utinam omni tempore jejunare possimus, quod in Actibus apostolorum die Pentecostes & die Dominico apostolorum Paulum, & cum eo credentes, fecisse legitur. Hier. ep. 52. al. 28. p. 579. in.

* Ad extremum, de sabbathi religionis inter pseudodiataxes apostolicas exstat Petri ac Pauli nomine edita sanctio l. viii. c. 33.

* ut eo die ac Dominico servi ab opere feriati sint. Hoc vero nunquam ab apostolis manasse decretum apparet ex eo, quod Laodicense Concilium, can. 29. diserte vetat sabbatho otiosos esse Christianos. Οἱ ἡμετέροις Χριστιανῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἰσχυρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, τὴν δὲ κυριακῇ προσκύμνωσιν, οἷον δύνασθαι, σχολάζειν, ὡς Χριστιανοί. Dominicis potius quam sabbathis, vacare jubet : & addit tamen, si illorum commodo fieri potest. Ut nondum illis temporibus ab omni opere feriatos esse penitus constitutum fuerit : uti Zonaras & Balsamo, ad illum canonem adnotant. Petav. ib. p. 360.

Socrates, in the fifth century, says, that ² Christian churches in general throughout the world met, and had the eucharist every week on the sabbath, excepting the churches of Rome and Alexandria. Sozomen, about the same time, says likewise, that ³ at Constantinople, and almost every where, except Rome and Alexandria, Christians assembled on the sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week. And in a pretended letter of St. Ignatius, composed by some ² idle Greek, it is said: He ² is an enemy to Christ, who fasts on the Lord's-day, or on any sabbath, except one.

But it does not appear, that the practice mentioned by Socrates and Sozomen, of assembling on the sabbath, obtained in the early days of Christianity. Nor was it universal in their time, as it would have been, in all probability, if it had been of apostolical appointment.

St. Luke informs us, Acts xx. 7. that *upon the first day of the week, when the disciples, at Troas, came together to break bread, Paul preached to them.* The same apostle, 1 Cor. xvi. 2. directs: *Upon the first day of the week, let every one lay by him in store:* meaning probably the same, which St. John, Rev. i. 10. calls the Lord's-day.

In like manner, in the times next following those of the New Testament, says Ignatius: 'Let ^b us no longer sabbatize, but keep the Lord's-day, on which our life arose.'

Justin Martyr: 'And ^c on the day called Sunday, is an assembly of all who live either in the city or the country, and the memoirs of the apostles, and the writings of the prophets are read.' He afterwards assigns their reasons ^d for meeting together on the Sunday: which are, because it is the first day, on which God dispelling darkness created the world, and our Saviour Jesus Christ rose from the dead on the same day: or in the words of a later writer, in the sixth century,

^x Τῶν γὰρ πανταχὺ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκκλησιῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σαββάτου, κατὰ πάσαν ἑβδομάδος περίοδον ἐπιτελούντων τὰ μυστήρια, οἱ ἐν Αἰγυπτίᾳ, καὶ οἱ ἐν Ρώμῃ, ἐκ τινὸς αρχαιᾶς παραδόσεως, τοῦτο ποιεῖν παρῴησαντο. Soz. H. E. l. v. c. 22. p. 286. D.

^y Ἀμείβει οἱ μὲν καὶ τῷ σαββάτῳ, ὁμοίως τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτῃ ἐκκλησιαζόμενοι, ὡς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, καὶ σιχίδον πανταχὺ. Ἐν Ρώμῃ δὲ, καὶ Αἰγυπτίᾳ, ἕκλι. Soz. l. vii. c. 19. p. 735. B. ^z Sed modum excedit Gratianus. Cotel. in loc.

^a Εἰ τις κυριακὴν ἢ σαββάτον ἡγνίσκει, πόλιν ἐνὸς σαββάτου, ἢ ἑὸς χριστοκίτου ἐστίν.

Ignat. adscript. Ep. ad Philip. n. 14. p. 124.

^b ——— μὴ ἐν σαββάτῳ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶμε ζώοντες, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέβηκεν δι' αὐτοῦ. Ignat. ad mag. nesc. cap. ix. p. 29.

^c Καὶ τῇ τῷ ἡλίου λήσμεν ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλιν ἢ ἀσφὺς μενοῦν ἐπὶ το αὐτὸ συνελθόντες γινώσκοντες. λ. Apol. 2. al. 1. p. 98. D. Paris. 1636.

^d Τῇ δὲ τῷ ἡλίου ἡμέρᾳ κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνελθόντες ποιούμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὑλὴν τρεῖς ἑκατομῶν ἐποίησεν καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. Ibid. p. 99. A. B.

on

on † the first day of the week, that is, on the Lord's-day the foundation of the world was laid, and the creation was begun.

Dionysius bishop of Corinth, in his letter to the church of Rome, says: 'To-day * we celebrated the holy Lord's-day, when we read your epistle to us.'

Clement of Alexandria mentions † the Lord's-day.

Tertullian rejects ‡ sabbaths and new moons, as foreign to Christians, and speaks of the Lord's-day, and Pentecost, as Christian solemnities.

Origen, in a passage cited not long before, mentions the Lord's-day, but says nothing of the sabbath.

I might likewise refer to what Eusebius says of Constantine's respect for the † Lord's-day. And I shall place in the margin some observations † of Petavius, agreeing with, and confirming what is here said.

So that the respect shewn for the sabbath, and joining it with the Lord's-day, are no marks of the antiquity of the Constitutions, but rather otherwise.

13.) Several inferior officers of the church, mentioned in the Constitutions, were not in being in the apostolical times, nor immediately after them. Beside bishops, presbyters, and deacons, here ‡ are readers, singers, subdeacons, door-keepers, or porters, and exorcists. Cotelerius says, that † Ignatius at

† Εν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ τέλει τῇ κυριακῇ, ἡ καὶ οὖσα τὴν κόσμῳ καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ κόσμου. Cosmae Egypt. Topogr. l. ii. p. 134. E. edit. Montfaucon.

* Τῇ κυριακῇ ἡν κυριακὴν αἰσαν ἡμερᾶν διήλυσεν. κ. λ. Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. iv. cap. 23. p. 145. B.

† Οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ κύριος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαπραξαμένος κυριακὴν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ποιῶν. Str. 7. p. 744. C. D.

‡ Nobis, quibus sabbatha extranea sunt, & neomeniae, & feriae, a Deo aliquando electae. — O melior fides nationum in sua sectam, quae nullam solemnitatem Christianorum sibi vindicat! Non Dominicum Diem, non Pentecosten, etiam si nosset, nobiscum communicassent. De Idolatr. cap. 14. p. 113. C.

† Vid. de Vit. Conf. l. iv. c. 18. & 23. Et Conf. Valesii Annot. in l. iv. c. 18. n. 242, 243.

‡ Denique quod Epiphanius admonet: 'triplicem illam synaxin diem totidem ab apostolis esse traditam.' haud scio, an satis certo constare queat. Nam primis ecclesiae temporibus unus duntaxat Dominicus dies ad eam rem observatus videtur, ut ex apostolo 1 ad Cor. cap. xvi. colligitur. Quinetiam Iustinus in Apol. ii. cum de Christianorum conventi-

bus agit, solius Dominicae meminit: Τὴν δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κοινῇ πάντες τῆς συνελθόντος ποιούμεθα. Quare magis id ex privato ecclesiae ejusque ritus quam ex communi apostolorum praescripto derivatum existimo, ut quarta sextave feria, aut etiam sabbatho synaxes conventusque fierent. Quam in rem egregius est Augustini locus ep. 18. 'Alia vero,' inquit, 'quae per loca terrarum regionesque variantur, sicuti est, quod alii jejuntant sabbatho, alii vero non: alii quotidie communiant corpori & sanguini dominico — alibi sabbatho tantum & Dominico: alibi tantum Dominico: & si quid aliud hujusmodi animadverti potest, totum hoc genus rerum liberas habet observationes.'

Petav. Animadv. in Epiph. p. 354. fin.

† Vid. l. ii. c. 25. p. 238. l. viii. c. 21 — 28.

‡ Aperte quidem S. Ignatius, qui initio secundi saeculi scripsit, agnoscit solummodo tres majores gradus, episcopatum, presbyteratum, diaconatum. Primus vero, quod sciam, Lectores nominavit Tertullianus. Libro de Pr. Haereticorum cap. 41. Hypodiaconi autem, Exorcistae & Acolythy, non comparent ante Cypriani cas epistolae, & epistolam Cornelii Panæ,

the beginning of the second century mentions only bishops, presbyters, and deacons; readers are first mentioned by Tertullian; subdeacons, exorcists, acolyths, and door-keepers, in the letters of Cyprian and Cornelius, about the middle of the third century. In the eighth book of this work are forms of ordination for subdeacons, readers, exorcists. It is also constituted, that ministers or deacons, singers, readers, door-keepers, should marry but once.

14.) The authority of Christian bishops is highly advanced in these Constitutions, in a way that does not suit the doctrine, or the character of Christ's apostles.

15.) 'Upon this account therefore, O bishop, take care to be pure in thy actions, behaving agreeably to thy place and dignity, as sustaining the character of God among men: being set over men, priests, kings, rulers, fathers, sons, masters, and all who are subject to thee. Judge therefore with authority, as God: but receive the penitent.' That is the character which the Constitutions direct a bishop to sustain, of God among men: whereas St. Paul says, *A bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God*, Tit. i. 7. Compare 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2. and 1 Pet. iv. 10.

16.) 'For it is not fit that you, O bishop, who are the head, should hearken to the tail, that is a seditious layman, to the destruction of another, but to God alone. For you are to govern those subject to you, and not to be governed by them.'

17.) 'Let a layman honour a good bishop, love and fear him, as lord and master, as the high-priest of God, as a teacher of piety. For he that hears him hears Christ: and he that despiseth him despiseth Christ.'

18.) 'You therefore, O bishops, are to your people priests and Levites,—who stand at the altar of the Lord our God, and offer to him reasonable and unbloody sacrifices, through Jesus the great high-priest.'

19.) 'Be you [or you are] to the laity among you prophets, rulers, governors, and kings: mediators between God and his faithful people, who receive and declare his word.'

quæ etiam Oſtarios adjungit. &c. Ad Const. l. ii. c. 25. not. 75.

in Vid. l. viii. c. 21, 22. 26.

n — υπηρέτας δὲ καὶ ψαλμῶδες, καὶ ἀναγιγνῶστας, καὶ σὺλλογους, καὶ αἰνῶς μοιδοῦντας εἶναι κελεύομεν. L. vi. c. 17. p. 347.

o — γνωρίζον τοὺς τρόπους σου καὶ τὴν ἀξίαν, ὡς θεὸν τύπον, ἔχον ἐν ἀνθρώποις τῶν παλίων ἀρχόντων ἀνθρώπων. L. ii. c. xi.

p Οὐδὲ γὰρ δικαίον, κεφαλὴν οἰᾶσαι, ὡς ἐπισκοπῆς, ἢ ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς, τῶν λαϊκῶν συνιστάμεν ἀνθρώπων — ἀρχὴν γὰρ σὶ χρητὴς ὑπακούων, ὡς μὲν ὑπ' αἰνῶν ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς. L. ii. c. 14. p. 223.

q — ὡς κυρίου καὶ δεσποτῆτος. — L. ii. c. 20. in.

r L. ii. c. 25. p. 237.

s ὅτι οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν λαϊκοὶ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, ἀρχιεπίσκοποι, καὶ ἡγούμενοι, καὶ βασιλεῖς. κ. λ. Ibid.

20.)

p. 379.

20.) 'The^t bishop, he is the minister of the word, the keeper of knowledge, the mediator between God and you in the several parts of divine worship. He is the teacher of piety: he is after God your father, who has begotten you again to the adoption of sons by water and the Spirit; he is^a your ruler and governor, your king and potentate: he is, after God, your God on earth, who ought to be honoured by you.——Let the bishop preside over you, as honoured with the authority of God, with which he rules over the clergy, and governs all the people.'

21.) 'These^x do you esteem your governors and kings; and pay tribute to them as kings.' The apostles of Christ knew how to direct and secure a competent maintenance for Christian ministers, without using such language as this, which could not, in this case, proceed from a humble temper of mind.

22.) Soon after in the same chapter: 'By^y how much therefore the soul is more valuable than the body, so much the priesthood excels the kingdom:——therefore you ought to love the bishop as a father, fear him as king, and honour him as lord.'

23.) 'For^z if he who rises up against kings is worthy of punishment;——how much more he who rises up against the priests? For by how much the priesthood is more noble than the royal power, as having it's concern about the soul; so much the greater punishment has he, who ventures [or dares] to oppose the priesthood, than he who opposes the royal power, though neither of them goes unpunished.'

24.) '——why^a then should not you esteem the dispensers of the word as prophets, and reverence them as gods.'

25.) 'You^b ought therefore, my brethren, to bring your sacrifices and offerings to the bishop, as to your high-priest, either by yourselves, or by your deacons. Nor do you bring those only, but likewise bring to him first-fruits, and tithes, and free-will offerings. For he knows who are in affliction, and gives to every one, as is convenient.' So then the bishop is to have the distribution of all the gifts of the laity: but he is not accountable to them; for it follows in another chapter: 'It^c becomes you therefore to give, him to

^t L. ii. c. 26. p. 239.

^a Οὗτος

μὴς ὡς βασιλευσι προσφασίς. L. ii. c. 24.

αρχὴν καὶ κλημενος ὑμῶν· υἱὸς ὑμῶν βασι-
λέως, καὶ δυνατὸς· ὅτις ὑμῶν ἐπισκοπὸς Θεὸς
μὴν Θεοῦ, ὃς σφειδὴ τῆς πατρὸς ὑμῶν τιμῆς
ἀπολαύει, κ. λ. Ibid.

^x Τέλεις ἀρ-

in. p. 244.

^y lb. p. 245.

^z L. vi. cap. 2. p. 330.

^a L. ii.

cap. 29.

^b L. ii. cap. 27. p. 241.

Conf. l. v. cap. 1.

^c L. ii. c. 35. fin.

' distribute:

‘ distribute : for he is the administrator and dispenser of ecclesiastical affairs [it should have been said, and secular affairs].
 ‘ Yet ^d thou shalt not call thy bishop to an account, nor ob-
 ‘ serve his administration or distribution ; how he does it, when,
 ‘ or to whom, or where ; nor whether he does it well, or ill :
 ‘ for there is one, who will call him to an account, even the
 ‘ Lord God, who put the administration into his hands, and
 ‘ honoured him with the priesthood.’ Were ever such in-
 structions given, before or since ? And can any man think, that
 the apostles of Christ would be at the pains to write instructions
 to cover or countenance mal-administration ?

26.) Having spoken of bishops, presbyters, deacons, readers, fingers, and door-keepers, it is immediately added : ‘ Let
 ‘ the laity therefore shew due honour and respect in their pre-
 ‘ sents to each order. Nor ^e let them easily [or upon all oc-
 ‘ casions] give trouble to the governor ; but let them signify
 ‘ their desires by the ministers, that is, the deacons, with
 ‘ whom they may be more free. For neither may we have
 ‘ access to Almighty God, but through Christ : in like man-
 ‘ ner let the laity make known their desires to the bishop by a
 ‘ deacon, and do as he directs.’ Very fine, truly ! for our
 Constitution-bishop is an eastern prince, who may not be seen
 or spoken to by mean people.

3. Several things in the Constitutions appear to be unworthy
 of the apostles of Christ.

1.) I am unwilling to insist upon the direction relating to
 the beard, though it be joined with other things of a like kind,
 as we have ^g in our present Constitutions, forbidding the wear-
 ing of fine stockings and shoes, and combing and curling the
 hair. However, two or three things I shall mention, and leave
 them to be considered by others.

2.) Concerning receiving persons to baptism : ‘ Let ^h a con-
 ‘ cubine, who is servant to an unbeliever, and confines herself
 ‘ to her master alone, be received : but if she be incontinent
 ‘ with others, let her be rejected.’ Few ⁱ will think, that St.
 Paul would deliver this Constitution, as he is here represented
 to do.

^d Οὐ μὴν τοὶ λογιστεύσεις σὺ τὸν ἐπίσκο-
 πον, ὅδε παραλήψεις τὴν οἰκονομίαν αὐτοῦ,
 πῶς ἐπιτελεῖ, ἢ πῶς, ἢ τίσιν, ἢ πῶ, ἢ ἐν
 καλῶς, ἢ φαυλῶς, ἢ δεινῶς. κ. λ. lb.

^e L. ii. cap. 28. ^f Μη ραδίως δὲ
 ἐνοχλείωσαν τῷ ἀρχιεπί, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν
 ὑπηρετῶν αὐτοῦ βυλοῦνται σημαίνειν, τῶς

διὰ τῶν διακόνων, πρὸς ὧς ὅτι παρρη-
 αζέσθωσαν. Ibid. ^g Vid. Const. l.
 i. c. 3.

^h Παλλακή τις ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιεπί, ἢ
 ἐκείνη μόνῃ σχολάζουσα, προσδεχέσθω. l.
 viii. c. 32. p. 413.

ⁱ Hæc scilicet
 Paulus decrevit ? Has ille leges tulit ? &c.
 Dal. de Pseud. l. i. c. 8. p. 108.

3.) The Constitution concerning married pregnant women^k I take to be contrary to the order of nature, and the appointment of Providence. God joined one man and one woman in marriage; and designed it for mutual comfort, as well as for the preservation of the species. For certain, Lactantius^l, the most learned Latin Christian of his time, knew nothing of this Constitution. And though he was a great admirer of purity, and all virtue, he has argued against the restraint here enjoined. This one Constitution, if strictly enforced, would render the gospel a heavier yoke than all the ordinances of the law of Moses. And wherever such an appointment should be reckoned a part of any religious institution, there would be frequent occasions for dispensations: and the rule would prove detrimental to the interests of religion and virtue, without benefit to any, but those who could get the dispensing power into their hands.

4.) Once more: 'Concerning^m bishops, we have heard from our Lord, that a person, appointed pastor or bishop in any parish should be unblameable, and not under fifty years of age.—But in a small parish, if one advanced in years cannot be found, let a younger person who is of good character be admitted. For Solomon at twelve years of age was king of Israel, and Josiah at eight years of age reigned righteously, and Joash began to reign at seven years of age.' This is tying and loosing, saying and unsaying, all at once; that is, it is saying nothing at all. This therefore appears to me unworthy of the apostles; for I cannot think, that they would say and unsay, all in a breath.

If any should understand this otherwise, and say, this Constitution requires, that no man be ordained bishop in a city, or large parish, under fifty years of age; it is obvious to answer, that it is an^{mm} absurd appointment, and therefore unworthy of the apostles. Nor do we know, that the Christians of the first three centuries acted by this rule: nor, finally, is there any such canon among those which are called apostolical.

^k Μηδὲ μὲν ἐκχυμοιῆσαις ομιλεῖν σαρ[φ] [αὐτῆς] αὐταῖς. L. vi. c. 28. p. 357. f.

^l Nec ob aliam causam Deus, cum cæteras animantes, suscepto sætu, maribus repugnare voluisset, solam omnium mulierem patientem viri fecit: scilicet, ne, feminis repugnantibus, libido cogeret viros aliam appetere, eoque facto castitatis gloriam non tenerent. Inst. l. vi. cap. 23. p.

628.

^m — τον ποιμένα του καθισταμενον επισκοπον εις τας εκκλησιας εν παση παροικια — ηκ ελαττον ειναι πιστευομενα. Ει δε και εν παροικια μικρα. — κ. λ. L. ii. cap. 1. ^{mm} This is particularly mentioned by Du Pin p. 17. as one of the absurdities found in the Apostolical Constitutions.

4. Inconsistencies are a disparagement to any writings: this work is not free from them.

1.) These Constitutions mention the martyrdoms of Stephen, and James the son of Zebedee, which are well known from the Acts; as also, that Stephen was stoned before Paul's conversion. And^a yet all the twelve apostles, and Paul, and the seven deacons, are said to join together in these Constitutions. The inconsistency is manifest to every body: I need not say any thing to make it evident.

2.) In the eighth chapter of the fifth book the apostles ordain, that martyrs be honoured, and particularly James and Stephen. And yet in the twelfth chapter of the sixth book, giving an account of the council of Jerusalem, the history of which we have in Acts xv. on occasion of the controversy concerning the method of receiving the Gentiles, it is said, 'that all the twelve apostles were then gathered together at Jerusalem, with James the Lord's brother.' Here, I think, is an inconsistency with what had been before said of the death of James, son of Zebedee: moreover here is also certainly a mistake, or false history; for the apostle James, just mentioned, had been beheaded by order of Herod Agrippa, before the meeting of the said council.

3.) At the end of that twelfth chapter, having inserted the epistle to the church of Antioch, and other churches, it is said by the apostles: 'This^p letter we sent to them; but we ourselves stayed some time at Jerusalem, consulting together about the public good, and the well ordering of all things.' Then in the thirteenth chapter: 'But^q after a long time we visited the brethren, confirming them in the word, and exhorting them to be upon their guard against heretics.' Then at the beginning of ch. xiv. 'On^r whose account we now being all met together, Peter and Andrew, James and John, sons of Zebedee, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Lebbeus surnamed Thaddeus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Matthias chosen in the room of Judas, and James the Lord's brother, and Paul, the chosen vessel and master of the Gentiles: we being all gathered together have written to you this catholic doctrine.' Surely I need not harangue to shew the absurdity

^a L. viii. c. 4. Conf. I. ii. c. 55.

^p Ημεῖς οἱ δώδεκα συνέλθοιτες εἰς Ἱερουσα-
λημ. κ. λ. L. vi. c. 12. p. 341. in.

^q Τὴν μὲν ἐν ἐπιτολῇν ἐξαπετείλαμεν
αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐν ἰκαναῖς ἡμέραις ἐν Ἱερουσαλὺμοῖς
ἐπιμακαμεν, ἀλλὰ συζήσεις πρὸς τὸ κοινόν.

φίλους εἰς διακρίσιν, p. 342. sub fin.

^r Μῆλα δὲ χρόνον ἱκανόν ἐπισκεψάμενοι
τῶν ἀδελφῶν. κ. λ. Ἦ Δὲ ὡς καὶ

ἡμεῖς τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γινόμενοι, ἐβραβήκαμεν
ἐμὴν τῇ καθολικῇ ταύτῃ διδασκαλίᾳ. p.
343.

of this.
bedee, w
council
after it
ful: and
ignorant

5. Th
betray a

1.) 'M
' ordain
' James,
' death t
' Judas
things de
of an hi
selves.
should b
ing to
and acco
reign of
thereabo

2.) T
' ignoran
' bishop
' appoin
3.) 'I
' the ch
' those v
' These
' the wh
by some

4.) A
' Ghost
they wor
expressio
time wh
apostles.

5.) S
' design

^a Περὶ δὲ
ἐπισκοπῶν
vii. c. 46.
p. 104. C.
^p L. viii.
p. L. vi.

of this. How could James, brother of John, and son of Zebedee, who had been beheaded before the above-mentioned council, be present at another, not held until a good while after it? Such things almost render the writer's abilities doubtful: and may make us question, whether he was not rather ignorant than learned, as some indeed have thought.

5. The style, or manner of expression, seems sometimes to betray a later time than is pretended.

1.) 'Now' concerning the bishops, which were [or have been] ordained in our life-time, we let you know that they are these: James, bishop of Jerusalem, brother of our Lord; upon whose death the second was Simeon the son of Cleophas; after him Judas the son of James.' And what follows. To speak of things done by the apostles in their life-time, is rather the style of an historian after their death, than of the apostles themselves. Nor is it easy to conceive, that any number of apostles should be living to ordain a successor to Simeon; who, according to Eusebius's history, died in the 120th year of his age: and according to Eusebius's, or Jerom's^a Chronicle, in the reign of Trajan, and the year of our Lord's nativity 107, or thereabout.

2.) To the like purpose in another place: 'You^x are not ignorant of the things done by us. Doubtless you know the bishops nominated by us, and the presbyters and deacons appointed by prayer and imposition of hands.'

3.) 'For' as we passed through the nations, and confirmed the churches, some we cured with healing words—but those who were incurable we cast out from the flock.—These things we did in every city, every where throughout the whole world.' This is not written by the apostles, but by some historian after their time.

4.) Again, 'For' by the laying on of our hands, the Holy Ghost was given to believers.' But if the apostles had spoke, they would have said: 'The Holy Ghost is given by us.' The expression in the Constitutions shews, they were written at a time when spiritual gifts were no longer bestowed by the apostles.

5.) Speaking of heretics: 'All' these had one and the same design.' Afterwards, 'Others^b said; and others taught.'

^a Περὶ δὲ τῶν ὑφ' ἡμῶν χειροτονησάντων
ἐπισκοπῶν ἐν τῇ ζῳῇ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ. κ. λ. L.
vii. c. 46. in.

p. 104. C.

^u p. 165.

^x L. viii. c. 46. p. 422. in.

^r L. vi. c. 18. p. 349.

^z Καὶ γὰρ

διὰ τῆς ἐπιθεσεως τῶν ἡμετέρων χειρῶν ἐδίδδο
πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῖς πιστευούσι. L. ii. c. 41.
p. 250.

^a Τίλοις δὲ πασι—σκοπος
ἦν αἷς. L. vi. c. 10. in.

δε ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐλθόν. lb.

^c Ἄλλοι δὲ—
ἐδίδασκον. Ibid.

Here the writer betrays himself: this is the style of an historian who writes of things past; not of one who relates things then doing, or gives an account of persons then in being. I put in the margin a remark of ^a Daillé upon some of the expressions just cited.

VII. All these things must be more than sufficient to satisfy us, that the Constitutions, in eight books, are not a work of the apostles: and since they bear their name, without reason, we are unavoidably constrained to own, they are an imposture. The nature of such a crime is well known, and I need not aggravate it. The character^c of a writer of this kind may be better taken from Abp. Usher, than from me. But I think, that any man may justly recommend to the contrivers and patrons of such works, the serious consideration of those words of Solomon, Prov. xxx. 6. *Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.*

The exact time of the work cannot be determined: but as divers learned men have delivered their conjectures, I may take the liberty to say, I incline to their opinion, who think it was composed in the latter part of the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth century. The author, probably, was a bishop of a proud and haughty spirit, who was fond of church-power, and loved pomp and ceremony in religious worship. Many learned moderns think he was an Arian; but I do not concern myself about that; the passages which have been supposed to favour Arianism, make a very small, or no part of the preceding collections: I have no reason, therefore, to bring that point into the conclusion. But I presume, that none ever suspected the author to be a Homousian.

VIII. Whoever was the author of this work, it is fit we should observe his testimony to the scriptures: for as the work is of some length, we may expect to see therein, in some measure, the sentiments and practice of the Christians of his time concerning them.

I. 'And^f the reader standing upon an eminence, in the middle of the church; let him read the books of Moses, and of Joshua the son of Nun, the Judges, the Kingdoms, and the Chronicles, and those^g concerning the return [from the captivity], and beside these the book of Job, and Solomon,

^a Nimirum iis temporibus vixit impostor, quibus utrique illi hæretici apud Christianos esse desierant. De Pseudep. Ap. l. i. c. 6. p. 96. ^c Ita enim bipedum nequissimus, qui Clementis personam quinto post

excessum ipsius seculo, induit. &c. Disser. Ignat. cap. vi. fin. l. ii. c. 57. p. 261, 262. ^g Kai ta teta apocrypha. lb.

‘and the sixteen prophets. And when there have been two readings, [or when two readings are over] let another sing [or read in a chanting manner] the hymns of David^h; and let the people repeat the conclusions in a chanting voice. Afterwards let our Acts be read, and the epistles of Paul, our fellow-worker, which he sent to the churches under the conduct of the Holy Spirit. And afterwards let a deacon, or a presbyter, read the gospels, which I Matthew, and I John, delivered to you, and those which the fellow-workers of Paul, Mark, and Luke received and left to you. After this let one of the presbyters exhort the people, and last of all the bishop.’

Many remarks might be made here; but the most important are obvious, and cannot well be overlooked by any. The author received four gospels, and no more; also the Acts of the apostles, and St. Paul’s epistles. Why the epistles of James, Peter, Jude, and John, are omitted, may not be easy to say; but that he received others, beside those here mentioned, will appear presently. As Mark is here considered as a fellow-labourer of the apostle Paul, it is likely, the writer means Mark, nephew to Barnabas, often mentioned in the Acts, and in several of St. Paul’s epistles, Col. iv. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Philem. 24.

2. In the above passage, the names of all the evangelists, writers of the four gospels, are expressly named. The Acts of the apostles likewise is in this work ascribed to¹ St. Luke.

3. All St. Paul’s epistles are here quoted, and most of them several times, particularly that to the Hebrews.

4. The writer received other epistles of apostles, beside those of Paul, as appears from those words, ‘And^k after the reading of the law, and the prophets, and our epistles, and the Acts of the apostles.’ That direction is given in the name of the twelve^l apostles.

5. There are supposed to be four or five quotations or references to the epistle of^m St. James; but they are not all clear.

6. It should be here observed by us, that this writer did not esteem James, brother of the Lord, and bishop of Jerusalem, one of the twelve apostles. He is distinguished from them in several placesⁿ of this work.

^h Αἱ αὐτοὶ δὲ γενομένων ἀναγνώσεων, ἑκάς τις τὰς τῆς Δαβὶδ ψαλλεῖν ὑμνῆς, καὶ ἑκάς τὰ ἀποστολικά υποψαλλεῖν. Ibid.
ⁱ Ὡς πρὸς λέγει ὁ Λῦκας. Ὡς ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰωάννης ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν. [Act. i. 1.]
 L. ii. c. 6. p. 217. in.

τῶν τε ἐπιστολῶν ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ τῶν εὐαγγελίων. L. viii. c. 5. p. 392.

¹ Vid. ib. c. 4. in.

^m Vid. l. ii.

c. 8. & c. 58. p. 266. l. vii. c. 5. l. viii.

c. 2.

ⁿ Vid. l. ii. c. 55. l. vi. cap.

12. in. & c. 14. l. viii. c. 46.

τῶν ἀποστόλων τῶν ἰσχυρῶν, καὶ τῶν προφητῶν,

7. There are several plain quotations of the first epistle of Peter. I put in the margin^o one or two: I transcribe one here for the sake of its singularity. 'You^p therefore are the holy^e and sacred church of God, *written* [or inrolled] *in heaven*,^e *a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, a bride* adorned for the Lord God.' Here is a reference to Heb. xii. 23. and 1 Pet. ii 9. Whether there be in the last words a reference to the Revelation, deserves to be considered; he may refer to^o Rev. xxi. 2. Or, perhaps he has no text of scripture at all in his eye.

8. There are no^r clear references to the second epistle of Peter.

9. There are not in the Constitutions any quotations of the three epistles of St. John, or of the epistle of St. Jude.

10. Some may wonder, that when there are so many quotations of St. Paul's epistles, and of most other books of the New Testament, there should be so few quotations of the catholic epistles. But that wonder may be abated, when we consider how little notice is taken of the catholic epistles, in comparison with Paul's, by divers learned Christian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who lived in the east.

St. Chrysostom, of the fourth century, has left homilies, or commentaries, upon the gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, the Acts of the apostles, and St. Paul's fourteen epistles, but none upon the catholic epistles. And there are in his homilies and commentaries, few quotations of the catholic epistles, in comparison of St. Paul's. In the index of scriptures, at the end of the tenth tome of his works, of the Benedictine edition, a large volume of 730 pages, containing homilies upon the first and second to the Corinthians, and commentaries upon the epistle to the Galatians, there is not one text from the catholic epistles, though there are quotations of the four gospels, the Acts, and all Paul's epistles, except that to Philemon: and of most of them several, or many quotations. In the index at the end of the eleventh tome is but one text of the first epistle of St. Peter, and one of the first epistle of St. John: whereas all St. Paul's epistles, without exception, are there quoted, and most of them often. In the index at the end of the twelfth tome there is not one text from the catholic epistles, though there are quotations of all the preceding books, or

^o Lib. iii. c. 15. sub fin. l. vii. c. 2. l. v. c. 16. p. 321. l. vi. c. 29. ^p Καὶ υμεῖς ἐν ἑστὶ ἀλῖα τῷ θεῷ ἡμεῖς ἐκκλησία ἀποστράμμενη ἐν ὕψους, βασιλεία ἡραλίουμα, ἁγίος ἁλῖος, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ἡμφη

κακαλλωτισμένη κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ. L. ii. c. 25. p. 238. m. ^q — ἡμεῖς ὡς νυμφὴν κακοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἁγίῳ. Apoc. cap. xxi. 2. ^s Vid. l. vii. c. 14.

epistles of them lieve, such t not om softom's catholic

Theo mentari ment, has non quote th It is not

11. I argumen publishi in the la would b Revelati writers, man em

12. T Constitu which w ther he times do me some New Te except th of the sa above-m

13. T adultery, at the be

14. T ture occu Gospel; and the l

15. T for the sa transcribe ing of th

^o Vid. l. ii.

epistles of the New Testament, and several quotations of most of them. Those indexes, indeed, may not be complete; I believe, they are not; though, I think, they are exacter than such things generally are. However, undoubtedly texts are not omitted designedly. The Benedictine editors of St. Chrysostom's works, were as willing to collect the quotations of the catholic epistles, as of any other books of the New Testament.

Theodoret, in the fifth century, who has questions, or commentaries, upon all, or most of the books of the Old Testament, and commentaries upon St. Paul's fourteen epistles, has none upon the catholic epistles. Nor does he in his works quote the catholic epistles oftener than St. Chrysostom has done. It is not needful to mention more particulars of this kind.

11. If the Revelation is not quoted here, that affords no argument, that the Constitutions were composed before the publishing of that book. If the Constitutions were drawn up in the latter part of the fourth, or in the fifth century, there would be little reason to expect in them any quotation of the Revelation; because at that time it was received by few Greek writers, or Christians who lived in the eastern part of the Roman empire.

12. There can be no question made, but the writer of the Constitutions received all those books of the New Testament, which were all along generally received by Christians. Whether he received those catholic epistles, which were at some times doubted of, we cannot say certainly; but it appears to me somewhat probable, that he received all those books of the New Testament, which are commonly received now by us, except the Revelation: concerning which, it is likely, he was of the same opinion with many other Greek writers of the time above-mentioned, by whom it was not received.

13. This^a author had the history of the woman taken in adultery, which we now have in St. John's gospel, chap. viii. at the beginning.

14. The common titles and divisions of the books of Scripture occur here frequently: the^b Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel; the^c Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, and the Gospel, and the like.

15. The respect of the writer, and of Christians in his time, for the sacred scripture, is manifest from many passages above transcribed, where they are quoted, and where the public reading of them in the assemblies of Christians is spoken of.

^a Vid. I. ii. c. 25. p. 236.

^b L. ii. c. 39. p. 249.

^c L. v. c. 19. p. 323.

16. Christians in general are exhorted to private reading the scriptures in this manner: 'Sitting' at home, read the Law, 'the Kingdoms, the Prophets, sing the hymns of David; and 'with care peruse the gospel, which is the completion of them.' More to the like purpose follows there in the next chapter.

17. When a bishop is ordained, it is appointed by all the apostles met together, 'that' the divine gospels be held open 'over his head by the deacons.'

IX. Concerning the Canons, the judgment of Cotelierus is, that 'they cannot be ascribed to the apostles, or Clement, because they are not received with other books of scripture, are not quoted by the writers of the first ages, and contain in them many things not agreeable to the apostolical times.

1. I do not think myself obliged to enlarge here: they who are curious may consult ^a Beveridge, ^b Daillé, ^c Turner, ^d Sarn. Basnage, and also James Basnage: which last says, that 'some of them are ancient, others not older than the seventh century. Not now particularly to mention any more authors.

2. The 85th canon contains a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament: I take only the latter part of it. 'But 'our sacred books, that is, of the New Testament, are the four 'gospels of Matthæw, Mark, Luke, John; fourteen epistles 'of Paul; two epistles of Peter; three of John; one of James, 'one of Jude; two epistles of Clement; and 'the Confi- 'tutions inscribed to you bishops, by me Clement, in eight 'books; which ought not to be divulged before all, because 'of the mystical things in them; and the Acts of us the 'apostles.'

3. Upon this canon I need not say any thing more, than that it is not ancient, or drawn up till after the end of the third century; which I think will appear from the following observations.

^x L. i. c. 5. Vid. et cap. 6.

^y — των δε διακορων τα δεκα ευαγγελια επι της τε χειρολογημενης κεφαλης ανεπισημια καλειχοντων. L. viii. c. 4. p. 391.

^z Decreta ista Apostolis et Clementi tribui non debere evincit, quod cum aliis sacrae scripturae voluminibus non legantur, quod a primorum seculorum scriptoribus non laudentur, quodque multa contineant nondum temporibus apostolicis recepta. Cotel. Jud. de Canon. Ap. ap. Patr. Ap. T. i.

^a Codex Canon. Illustrat.

^b De Pseudep. Ap. p. 581—593.

^c As before, p. 279. &c. ^d Canonum, qui Apostolici usurpantur, non Clementem Rom. non Alexandrinum, sed

Anonymum quinto seculo collectorem fuisse existimamus. Qui corrasis complurium synodorum decretis, seculis secundo, tertio, quarto labentibus congregatarum, synodorum confecit suum. Ann. 900. n. 14. Vid. et 15—17.

^e On peut ajoûter à ce recueil les canones de Apôtres dont quelques uns sont assez anciens, et les autres ne sont fait qu'au septième siècle. Hist. de l'Egl. l. ix. c. 7. n. 5.

^f Καὶ αἱ διατάξεις τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν δι' ἡμῶν κλημάτων καὶ οὐκ ὡς βίβλοις προσπιφνημέναις, ἀλλ' ὡς δημοσίως ἐπὶ πάντων, διὰ τὰ ἰσχυρὰ μυστικά καὶ αἱ πράξεις ἡμῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων. Can. 85.

1.) The epistle to the Hebrews was rejected, or doubted of by many in the first three centuries, and also in the fourth century: but if this canon had been then in being, and acknowledged as apostolical, that epistle would have been received by all.

2.) Several of the catholic epistles, that of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and that of Jude, were rejected, or doubted of by many in the early times of Christianity: whereas they would have been received by all if this canon had been in being, and had been acknowledged to be apostolical. Mill^s has already argued in this manner, and, I think, invincibly.

3.) The Revelation was received by many in the second, and third, and following centuries; which it would not have been, if there had been a canon composed by the apostles, or Clement their companion, in which all other books of scripture were distinctly enumerated, and that omitted.

Baronius has very good observations, in my opinion, upon this 85th, or last canon of the apostles. How^h could so many of the Latin and Greek writers, says he, receive the Revelation, which was wanting in an apostolical canon? And how could there have been such different opinions about the epistle to the Hebrews, and several of the catholic epistles, if they had been made canonical by an apostolical decree.

4.) The first epistle of Clement was reckoned canonical by a very few, if any of the writers of the first three centuries: therefore this pretended apostolical canon, which placeth it among books of sacred scripture, was not in being.

5.) The second epistle, called Clement's, was not¹ esteemed his in the third century: and that it is not a genuine work of his, has been clearly^k shewn.

6.) The Constitutions are never reckoned among canonical books of scripture by any writers of the first three centuries.

7.) Finally, the silence here enjoined with regard to the

¹ Unde constat, canonem 85. ex his qui Apostolici dicuntur, in quo epistola Jacobi, ceteræque supra memoratæ inter canonicas recensentur, haud genuinum esse, neque primis sæculis existisse. — Certe, si Canon iste mox ab initio existisset, ecclesiæ ab Apostolis fundatæ epistolas isto Canone approbatas nequaquam repudiassent, aut in dubium vocassent. Proleg. n. 201.

^h Rursum vero, quod ad novissimum illum canonem spectat, qua libri canonici recensentur: Ecquis unquam antiquorum

Latinorum atque Græcorum adnumerare inter canonicos libros præsumisset Apocalypsim, quam scisset in Apostolorum canone prætermittam, qui vel saltem causam aliquam ejusmodi silentii non adduxisset? — Vel quid quod cum de his frequens inter Patres oborta sit controversia, nemo penitus reperiatur, qui ejusmodi canonis vel saltem obiter meminerit. Ann. 102. n. 15, 16.

¹ Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. iii. c. 38. et Hieron. de V. I. cap. 15. ^k See vol. ii. p. 26—29.

Constitutions, because of the 'mystical things' contained in them, is another argument, that this canon was not drawn up in the early days of Christianity. For the *Disciplina arcani*, or Doctrine of Arcanism, has no countenance from the authentic books of the New Testament: and was also unknown to Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, and other primitive Christian writers; who declare freely, and without reserve, before all the world, the principles of their religion, and their method of worship; as has been often observed by learned men of late times. And, I pray, why is this reserve enjoined, with regard to the Constitutions only? Are there no 'mysteries' in any other books here mentioned? And are there not in the Constitutions many directions given to the laity, and to all men in general? Are they not at the beginning inscribed to 'all who from among the Gentiles have believed in Jesus Christ?' There must have been some particular reason for this caution. And possibly this may be as probable a reason as any; that the composer of this canon, who was either the author, or at least a great favourer of the Constitutions, being conscious of their novelty, inserted this caution with a view to evade, or weaken, the argument against their genuineness and authority, taken from the silence of antiquity about them. I place at the bottom of the page an¹ observation of Abp. Usher to the like purpose.

Upon the whole, I think, these observations demonstrate the late date of this canon, and that it had not a being in the first three centuries, or for some time after. Consequently, it deserves not the regard of Christians now, who are willing to be determined by evidence.

¹ Ita enim bipedum nequissimus, qui Clementis personam (quinto post excessum ipsius seculo) induit, Constitutionibus a seipso interpolatis, et in aliam pene speciem transformatis canonicam auctoritatem conciliare conatus est: ea tamen ad mysterium iniquitatis suae celandum cautione adhibita,

ut eas nullo modo divulgandas — precipere. Ex quibus et Albaspinxus [Obs. l. i. c. 13.] recte observavit, Constitutiones hasce primis seculis factas non esse: cum primi seculi Christiani sua lubentes mysteria, ut vel ex Justino constat, enuntiant. Usher. Proleg. seu Diss. Ignat. cap. vi. fin.

THE
C R E D I B I L I T Y
OF THE
G O S P E L H I S T O R Y,
P A R T II.

[VOL. IX. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCLIII.]

P R E F A C E.

SOME, it is likely, will take notice, that there are in this volume several writers prior in time to some in the preceding volume. The reason is this, I was desirous that Ephrem the Syrian should be in the former volume; and the chapter was completed as far as could be from the Greek edition of his works at Oxford, and the first two volumes of the edition begun at Rome; but being informed, that the remaining volumes of the Roman edition might be expected in a short time, I determined to wait for them: nor did they come to my hands till several months after the publication of the eighth volume. Ephrem being laid aside, I took Epiphanius: the Apostolical Constitutions naturally followed, which being a long chapter, some others were excluded. Moreover, concerning divers of the articles in this volume which precede St. Basil, I was for a while in suspense, whether they should be inserted in this work at all: but at length I have judged it best, to omit very few, or no writers, who flourished in the fourth century, and are in St. Jerom's Catalogue. This is the whole occasion of the transgression in the order of time: which, I presume, needeth not to be reckoned a thing of much consequence.

C H A P. LXXXVI.

RHETICIUS, BISHOP OF AUTUN,

'RHETICIUS', or RETICIUS, bishop of Autun,' says Jerom, 'was a man of great note in Gaul, in the time of the emperor Constantine. There are extant his Commentaries upon the Canticles, and another large work against the Novatians. Nor have I met with any other writings of his.'

2. Rheticius was mentioned by us^b formerly, in the history of the Donatists. He^c was one of the Gallican bishops appointed by Constantine to hear Cæcilian and them, in a council at Rome in 313. He was also present at the council of Arles, relating to the same cause, in 314.

3. Rheticius's Commentary upon the Canticles is mentioned by Jerom in some of his letters. I shall place a part of what he says^d below. He owns, that^e there was somewhat agreeable in the style; but says, the work was of little use for assisting men to understand the sacred author. He mentions some trifling thoughts: and blames Rheticius for not having first consulted Origen, and other interpreters, before he attempted to write a commentary himself.

4. Rheticius is mentioned by Augustine in his writings against the Pelagians. He speaks^f of him, as a man of great

^a Rheticius Aduorum, id est, Augustodunensis Episcopus, sub Constantino celeberrimæ sanctæ habitus est in Galliis. Leguntur ejus Commentarii in Cantica Canticorum, et aliud grande volumen adversus Novatianum. Nec præter hæc quicquam ejus operum reperi. De V. I. cap. 82.

^b See p. 96. ^c Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. x. c. 5. p. 39. et Optat. l. i. c. 13.

^d Ob hoc et ego obsecro, et tu ut petas plurimum quæso, ut tibi beati Rheticii Augustodunensis Episcopi Commentarios ad describendum largiatur, in quibus Canticum Canticorum sublimi ore disseruit. Ad Florent. ep. 4. al. 6. T. iv. p. 6. in.

^e Nuper quum Rheticii Augustodunensis Episcopi, qui quondam a Constantino Imperatore sub Silvestro Episcopo ob causam Montensium missus est Romam, Commentarios in Canticum Canticorum perlegissem, — vehementer miratus sum, virum eloquentem, præter ineptias sensuum cæterorum, Tharsis urbem putasse Tarsum, in qua Paulus Apostolus natus sit. — Innumera-bilia sunt, quæ in illius mihi Commenta-

riis fovere visa sunt. Est quidem sermo compositus, et Gallicano cothurno fluens. Sed quid ad interpretem, cujus professio est, non quo ipse disertus appareat, sed quo eum qui lecturus est, sic faciat intelligere, quomodo ipse intellexit qui scripsit. Rogo, non habuerat Origenis volumina? non interpretes cæteros? non certe aliquos necessarios Hebræorum, ut aut interrogaret, aut legeret, quid sibi vellent quæ ignorabat? Sed tam male videtur existimasse de cæteris, ut nemo possit de ejus erroribus judicare. Frustra ergo a me ejusdem viri Commentarios postulas, quum mihi in illis displiceant multo plura, quam placeant. &c. Ad Marcell. Ep. 133. al. ep. 10. inter criticas. T. ii. p. 662. 624.

^f Rheticius ab Augustoduno Episcopum magnæ auctoritatis in ecclesia tempore episcopatus sui, gesta illa ecclesiastica nobis indicant, quando in urbe Roma, Melchiade apostolicæ sedis Episcopo præsentante, cum aliis judex interfuit, Donatumque damnavit, qui prior auctor Donatistarum schismatis fuit, & Cæcilianum Episcopum ecclesiæ

repute in his time, and has twice quoted a passage of his concerning baptism, as favouring the doctrine of original sin. But it does not appear, whence that passage is taken; whether from one of the books mentioned by Jerom, or from some other work, or from the debates in one of the councils above taken notice of.

5. I have thought it best to give some account of this eminent bishop and commentator, who flourished at the beginning of the fourth century, though his writings are not now extant. And I refer my readers^a to some learned moderns, whom they may consult, if they think fit.

C H A P. LXXXVII.

T R I P H Y L L I U S.

1. TRIPHYLLIUS^a bishop of a city in Cyprus about the year 340, and afterwards, was a man of great repute for eloquence in the time of the emperor Constantius, as we learn from Jerom, whose article I place at length^b below. He assures us, that Triphyllius wrote a Commentary upon the Canticles, which he had read, and divers other works, which he had not met with. Triphyllius is likewise placed by Jerom among^c other eminent Christian writers in his letter to Magnus.

Carthaginensis absolvit. Is cum de baptismo ageret, ita locutus est: 'Hanc igitur principalem esse in Ecclesia indulgentiam, neminem præterit, in qua antiqui criminis omne pondus exponimus, et ignorantie nostræ facinora prisca delemus, ubi et veterem hominem cum ingenuis sceleribus exuimus.' Audis 'antiqui criminis pondus.' Audis 'prisca facinora.' Audis 'cum sceleribus ingenuis hominem veterem.' Et audes adversus hæc ruinosam construere novitatem? Contr. Julian. Pelagian. l. i. cap. iii. n. 7. T. 10. P. i.

Si vis agnoscere vetustatem, ex qua parvuli Christiana gratia renovantur, audi fideliter quod ait homo Dei Rheticius ab Augustoduno Episcopus, qui cum Melchiae Romano Episcopo quondam iudex fedit, Donatumque damnavit hæreticum. Hic enim, cum de Christiano baptismo loqueretur, 'Hanc igitur,' inquit, 'prin-

'cipalem esse in Ecclesia indulgentiam.'—Audisne, non postea perpetrata, sed etiam 'ingenua scelera veteris hominis?' Numquid Manichæus fuit iste Rheticius? Op. Imperf. l. i. cap. cv. T. 10. P. 2.

^a Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 173. Fabr. ad Hieron. de V. I. cap. 82. Du Pin Bib. T. ii. p. 26. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. vi. Les Donatistes. Art. 12.

^b Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 206. Fabr. Bib. Ec. ad Hieron. de V. I. cap. 92.

^c Triphyllius, Cypri Ledrensis, sive Leucotheon, episcopus, eloquentissimus suæ ætatis, et sub rege Constantio celeberrimus fuit. Legi ejus in Cantica Cantorum commentarios. At multa alia composuisse fertur, quæ in nostras manus minime pervenerunt. De Vir. Ill. cap. 92.

^e Exstat et—libri—et Triphyllii Cyprii. Ep. 83. T. iv. p. 656.

2. Suidas in his *Lexicon*^d says: 'Triphyllius, a bishop, and disciple of Spyridion of Cyprus, who wrought many miracles, wrote an account of our holy father Spyridion.' It is not unlikely, that this may be one of the many works of Triphyllius which Jerom had not met with.

3. Sozomen relates divers things of Spyridion, or Spyridon, which are not very easy to be credited. One story however may be true enough; it is to this purpose. There being upon some occasion a synod of the bishops of Cyprus, Spyridion and Triphyllius were present. Triphyllius had studied the Roman laws at Berytus for considerable time, and was in repute likewise for his skill in other parts of learning. At an assembly for divine worship, Triphyllius was called upon to preach; and when he alleged that text [Mark ii. 9.] *Arise, take up thy bed, or couch, and walk*: instead of the popular word in the evangelist, he made use of another Greek word, reckoned more elegant: at which Spyridion being much offended, rose up from his seat, and before all the people said aloud, 'Are you better than he who said *couch*, that you are ashamed to use his expressions?'

4. If this be true, we have an argument of the virtue, particularly of the humility of Triphyllius, in that work of his where he celebrated Spyridion and his miracles. The public reproof which he had received, produced no lasting resentment in his mind; he still honoured his master: he was therefore both a learned, and a good man, though, as it seems, too credulous.

5. Rufinus^f supposes, Spyridion to have been present at the council of Nice: and tells divers strange stories of him, which Socrates^e transcribed into his *Ecclesiastical History*. They who desire to know more of Spyridion, may consult^h Tillemont.

^d V. Τριφυλλιος. Τριφυλλιον τον λιδων επισκοπον ανδρα αλλως τι ιλλοσιμον, και δια νομων ασκησει πολυν χρονον εν τη βερυτιαν πολει διατριψαντα. Συναξειως δε επικλημενης, επιγραφεις τριφυλλιος διδασκει το πληθος, οπει το εθλος εκεινο παρασεν εις μισον ειδικει, το αρρον εν τον κραββατιον, και περιπατει, σκιμποδα αντην, τη κραββατι μετ' αβαντων το ονομα ειπει. Και ο σπυριδων ανανανησας, υ συς, ιφη, αμεινω τη κραββατι

^e — και ηερκελος, ος ταις αυτη λεξιων ιταρχη κηρησθαι; τειο επων, απιπνδου τε ιταρχη θρονη, τε δημη ορνωτος. κ. λ. Sozom. l. i. c. 11. p. 416, 417. ^f Ex eorum numerosa (et si quid adhuc eminentius) fuisse dicitur etiam Spiridion Cyprius Episcopus, vir unus ex ordine Prophetarum: quantum etiam nos eorum qui eum viderunt relatione comperimus. &c. Rufin. H. E. l. i. cap. 5. ^g Soer. l. i. c. 12. ^h Mem. Ec. T. vii.

CHAP. LXXXVIII.

FORTUNATIANUS.

1. As JEROM has a chapter for Fortunatianus, I transcribe it ^a below. He was born in Africa, but was bishop of Aquileia in Italy. In the reign of Constantius he wrote short commentaries or notes upon the gospels in a homely style. Fortunatianus is placed by Cave ^b at the year 340.

2. Though Jerom there speaks of Fortunatianus's commentaries as brief and rustic, he did not intirely neglect them. In a letter to Paul of Concordia, still extant, he intreats him ^c to send him those commentaries: and in the preface to his own commentary upon St. Matthew, he acknowledges, that ^d he had read what Fortunatianus had written upon that gospel.

CHAP. LXXXIX.

PHOTINUS.

I. *His history.* II. *Principles.* III. *Writings.* IV. *Character.* V. *Scriptures received by him.* VI. *His sect subsisted for some time.*

I. 'PHOTINUS of Galatia,' says ^a Jerom, 'disciple of Marcellus, and bishop of Sirmium, endeavoured to revive the heresy of Ebion. Being afterwards banished by the emperor Valentinian, he wrote many volumes; among which, the chief are his books against the Gentiles, and to Valentinian.'

Photinus was a native of Galatia, as Jerom intimates, and probably of Ancyra, the chief city. The same is intimated

^a Fortunatianus, natione Afer, Aquileiensis Episcopus, imperante Constantio, in Evangelia, titulis ordinatis, brevi et rustico sermone scripsit commentarios. Et in hoc habetur detestabilis, quod Liberium Romanæ Urbis Episcopum, pro fide ad exilium pergentem, primus sollicitavit ac fregit, et ad subscriptionem hæreseos compulit. De V. l. cap. 97. Vid. Fabr. in h. l. et conf. Tillemont. Mem. T. vi. Les Ariens. art. 31. et 69. ^b H. L. T. i. p. 206. ^c Et ne putes modica esse quæ deprecor—scilicet Commentarios Fortunatiani—

Ad Paul. Concord. ep. 10. al. 21. T. iv. p. 17. in.

^d Legisse me fateor in Matthæum—et Latinorum, Hilarii, Victorini, Fortunatiani opuscula. Prolog. in Matt. T. iv.

^a Photinus de Gallogrecia, Marcelli discipulus, Sirmii Episcopus ordinatus, Hebionis hæresim instaurare conatus est. Postea a Valentiniano Principe pulsus Ecclesia plura scripsit volumina: in quibus vel præcipua sunt contra Gentes, et ad Valentinianum libri. De Vir. Ill. cap. 107.

by^b others. Jerom here, and^c Sulpicius Severus, and^d others, call him disciple of Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, of whom we have †† spoken formerly. He^e is also said to have been deacon to Marcellus.

The time when Photinus was ordained bishop of Sirmium, is not exactly known; nor when he first began to publish his peculiar principles, whether in 341, or 343: but he was first condemned by the Arians or Eusebians^f in a synod held at Antioch in 344, or 345. He was afterwards condemned in several councils. But it was not easy to remove him, because^g of the affection which the people of Sirmium had for him, who would not part with him. In the end he was condemned and deposed in a council at Sirmium, held in 351, as is now generally supposed: after which he was banished. There being some difficulties about the time of the just mentioned council, and other councils relating to Photinus, which for the sake of brevity I do not choose to concern myself with; I refer to several learned^h moderns, who have written his history, in which there are divers intricacies.

Jerom says, that Photinus was banished by Valentinian; which creates a difficulty: for the council of Sirmium, by which Photinus was deposed, and after which he was banished, was held in the time of Constantius, who died in 361, whereas Valentinian did not begin to reign before 364. Someⁱ therefore have thought, that what Jerom says here is a slip of memory, or mistake through haste, putting Valentinian for Constantius. Others^k account for it in this manner; Photinus,

^b — γενος της μικρας Γαλαλιας. Socr. l. ii. c. 18. p. 96. D.

^c Οι απο Μαρκελου και Φωτεινου ασκυροσλατων. Ap. eund. cap. 19. p. 99. B.

^d Et tamen hoc ipsum Marcellum gravabat, quia Photinus auditor ejus fuisse in adolescentia videbatur. Sulp. Sev. Hist. Socr. l. ii. c. 36.

^e — Μαρκελου τι τε καθρημενη μαθητης, ακολουθειν τω διδασκαλω, κ. λ. Socr. l. c. 18. p. 96. D.

^f See p. 276.

^g Photinus Sirmienſis Episcopus fuit a Marcello imbutus. Nam et Diaconus sub eo aliquamdiu fuit. Hilar. Fragment. ii. n. 19. p. 1275.

^h Vid. Athanas. de Synod. n. vi. vii. et conf. Socrat. l. ii. cap. 18, 19.

ⁱ Verum inter hæc Sirmium convenitur Photinus hæreticus comprehensus, olim reus pronuntiatus, et a communione jampridem unitatis abscissus, nec tum quidem per factionem populi potuit amoveri. Hilar. Fragm. ii. n. 21. p. 1299. Vid. et n. 22.

^b Vid. Cav. H. L. Ann. 344. T. i. p. 209. and Life of St. Athanasius, n. xi. p. 127—129. in Lives of the Fathers of the fourth century. Du Pin. Bib. T. ii. p. 112. Tillem. Mem. T. vi. Les Ariens. Art. 37. 41. 44. 46, 47. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 314. et seq. T. xi. p. 378. not. Petav. Diff. de Photin. Damasc. ap. Labb. Concil. T. ii. p. 279. &c. et Animadvers. in Epiph. H. 73. p. 304. &c. Tho. Ittigii Historia Photini in Appendix librum de Hæresiarchis. Diff. M. Lacroix de Photino hæretico, ejusque multiplici damnatione. Baron. Ann. 357. n. i. et seqq. Pagi Ann. 344. 345. 347. n. v. viii. xv. 349. n. vi. vii. 351. n. x. xi. et seqq. Basnag. Ann. 345. n. v. 349. n. viii. 351. n. vi. viii. Athanas. Vit. a Benedicto adornat ad Ann. Chr. 343. 347. 349. 351.

^k Vid. Petav. Animadv. ad Epiph. H. 71. p. 304. k Vid. Fabr. ad Hieron. de V. I. cap. 107. et ad Philastr. cap. 65.

they suppose, must have been restored by the edict of Julian, together with other bishops banished in the reign of Constantius; and Photinus was banished a second time, in the time of Valentinian, if Jerom is not mistaken. And indeed, there is in Facundus ¹ a letter of Julian to Photinus, if it be genuine; and it is very complaisant.

It is concluded from Jerom's ^m Chronicle, that Photinus died in 375 or 376. He seems to have been living, when ^a Epiphanius wrote the article of his heresy in 375. Optatus ^{*} who wrote about 368, may be understood to speak of him as then living.

Whenever that council of Sirmium was held, by which Photinus was deposed and banished, there ^p was a conference held concerning his doctrine, at his request. The principal disputant on the other side was Basil, the Arian bishop of Ancyra, who had been put in the room of Marcellus: and it is said, that Basil triumphed in the argument. The disputation was taken down by notaries appointed for that purpose; and there were several copies made of it, one to be sent to the emperor Constantius, another for the synod, and a third for the courtiers that were present, and before whom the conference was held by the emperor's order. But there is nothing of it remaining: if it had been still extant, in all probability it would have appeared curious to some in our times.

Socrates says, that ^q after Photinus had been deposed, the bishops offered to restore him, if he would recant: but he refused. Sozomen ^r speaks to the like purpose. And perhaps Philaster refers to this, in a place to be taken notice of by and by; where he says, that Photinus refused to subscribe the creed which the synod had composed.

Germinius, an Arian, often mentioned by Athanasius, and the ecclesiastical historians, was successor of Photinus.

II. Accounts of Photinus's principles may be seen in many authors, particularly in the Symbol of the Eusebian Council at Antioch, where he was first condemned. They ^s join him

¹ Vid. Facund. l. iv. cap. 2. p. 59.

^m Chr. p. 187.

ⁿ Vid. H. 71.

^o i. et Indic. Hæref. p. 808.

^p *Diffum est hoc de Photino præsentis temporis hæretico, qui Filium Dei ausus est dicere, tantummodo hominem fuisse, non Deum.* Optat. l. iv. c. 5.

^q Vid. Epiph. H. 71. n. i. p. 829. Socrat. l. ii. cap. 29. et 30. Sozom. l. iv. cap. 6.

^r Τέλεις τον Φωτινον και μελα βαπτιστην συνισθαι και συνυπογραψαι συμ-

πειθειν επειρωνιο, επαγγελιαμενοι αποδωσιν αυτω την επισκοπην, και εκ μελαινιας ανα-
θιμαιση μιν το παριυρεθεν αυτω δογμα, συνθηκαι δε τη αυλων γνωμη. Socr. l. ii. c. 30. p. 125. D.

^s Soz. l. iv. c. 6.

^t Τοιουτοι δε εισιν οι απο Μαρκελλου, και Φωτινου των ασχυρεσ-
τατων, οι την προαιωνιον υπαρξιν του Χριστου, και την θεοτητα, και την αληθεινην αυτην βασιλειαν ομοιως ιουδαιοις αθετησιν, επι-
προφασει τε συνισσασθαι δοκει τη μεταρχια-

and Marcellus together, as denying the divinity and eternal pre-existence of the Son, and the personality of the Word, under a pretence of maintaining the divine Unity.

Philaster says little more of Photinus, than ^a that he held the same opinion with Paul of Samosata, and that he would not renounce it: for which reason he was deposed, and excluded from the church of Sirmium, by the bishops who had convicted him.

Epiphanius, in his Summary, says, that Photinus was of the same opinion with Paul of Samosata; though in some respects he expressed himself differently. But both agreed, that ^a Christ began to exist when he was born of Mary. In like manner, in his fuller account: that ^a he was not from eternity, but he was born of Mary, and the Holy Ghost came upon him: that ^a he was born of the Holy Ghost and Mary, and on that account was the Son of God.

Socrates says, that ^a Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, native of Galatia, following his master Marcellus who had been deposed, maintained, that Christ was a mere man: and that the bishops assembled at Sirmium deposed him, having found that he held the doctrine of Sabellius of Lybia, and Paul of Samosata.

Sozomen's account is, that ^a Photinus taught, there is one God Almighty, who by his own word made all things: that he did not allow the eternal generation and subsistence of the Son, but said that the Christ began to be, when he was born of Mary. He ^b was deposed as holding the doctrine of Sabellius, and Paul of Samosata.

Theodoret does little more than say, that ^a Photinus held the same doctrine with Sabellius, except that he set it forth in a somewhat different manner; and that he was confuted by

Ισμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡμεῖς ἔχ' ἀπλὰς λόγον προ-
φορικόν, ἢ ἐνδιαβόλον τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ζῶντα
Θεὸν λόγον καθ' αὐτὸν ὑπαρχοῦσα, καὶ ὕιον
Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ. κ. λ. Apud Athanas. De
Synod. p. 740. n. vi. Vid. et n. vii. Et
apud Socrat. H. E. l. ii. c. 19. p. 99.

^a Photinus doctrinam ejus secutus in
omnibus similiter prædicabat. Inque hoc
mendacio perseverans, projectus est de ec-
clesia Sirmienſium civitatis, a sanctis Epif-
scopis superatus. Philatt. cap. 65. p. 128.
ed. Fabric.

^u — Καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ
ἀπὸ μαρίας καὶ θυρο τοῦ Χριστοῦ διαβέβαι-
νύται. Indic. p. 808.

^x Φασκεῖ δὲ
ἰσὺς, ἀπαρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ εἶναι, ἀπὸ δὲ
μαρίας καὶ θυρο αὐτοῦ ὑπαρχεῖν, ἐξοῦς, φησι,
τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπηλθὲν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ

ἐγενήθη ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου. H. 71. n. i.
p. 829. A. B. γ — γενήθη:

Χριστὸς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἀπὸ μαρίας.
lb. n. ii. p. 830. z — ἀναλῶν

τῶν διδασκαλῶν, ἴδιον ἀνθρώπου τοῦ Ἰω-
ἰδοῦματι. κ. λ. Socr. l. ii. c. 18. p. 96. D.

^a Εἰσὶν δὲ ὡς Θεὸς μὲν ἐν παντὶ αἰῶνι
εἰς, οὗ τῶν ἰδίων λόγων τὰ πάντα δημιουργήσας
τὴν δὲ πρὸ αἰώνων γένεσιν τι καὶ ὑπαρξὴν
τῷ Ἰω ὡς προσέειπε· ἀλλ' ἐκ μαρίας γενέ-
σθαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐσηγήσατο. Soz. l. iv. c. 6.
p. 542. A. b Ibid. D.

^c Οὗ δὲ Φωστίνος μίαν ἐκείνην πᾶν
καὶ ἕν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα εἶναι, ἵνα
οἰομασὶ τὴν τῶν Σαβελλίου διδασκαλίαν κερ-
τῶν διακρίαν. κ. λ. Hæg. Fab. l. ii. c. 11.
in.

Diodorus

Diodorus of Tarsus in Cilicia. To which^d there may be reckoned to be a reference in the letter ascribed to the emperor Julian, as preserved in Facundus.

Photinus is in Augustine's^e book of Heresies; but I do not think it needful to transcribe him. However, in other places also he mentions the Photinians, and shews their sentiment. They said, that^f Christ was a man, and a great prophet, and excelled all men, the best and most knowing, in wisdom and holiness; but he was not God. They said, that^g the Father only is God, and Christ a man: and they denied the personality of the Spirit.

Sulpicius Severus was quoted before. I transcribe another passage^h in the margin.

Vincent's account is as well expressed as most; I put it belowⁱ at length. 'Photinus holds the unity of God after the Jewish manner. He allows not of any Trinity of persons. He says, that Christ was a man born of Mary. He denies the personality of the Word and the Spirit. There is only one God the Father, and Jesus Christ, whom we ought to serve.'

Marius Mercator supposes Photinus to have taught, that^k Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, after the manner of other men. But that is contrary to what is said by others, particularly by Epiphanius, who represents him to have taught, that Christ was born of the Holy Ghost and Mary. St. Ambrose likewise, not yet quoted, represents the doctrine of Photinus to be, that^l Christ did not exist, till he was born of the Virgin:

^d Julianus etenim, perfidus Imperator, sic Photino hæresiarchæ adversus Diodorum scribit: Tu quidem, O Photine, verisimilis videris, et proximus salvari, bene faciens, nequaquam in utero inducens quem credidisti Deum — Diodorus autem Nazareus magus — acutus apparuit Sophista religionis agrestis. Ap. Facund. l. iv. c. 2. p. 59.

^e Cap. 45.

^f Quam multi dicunt, homo fuit magnus? Quam multi dicunt, Propheta fuit? Quam multi antichristi, ut Photinus, homines sunt, plus nihil habuit: sed omnes homines pios et sanctos excellentia sapientiæ et justitiæ superavit. Serm. 246. n. 4. T. v.

^g Photiniani quoque Patrem solum esse dicentes Deum, Filium vero non nisi hominem, negant omnino esse tertiam personam Spiritum Sanctum. Serm. 71. cap. iii. n. v.

^h T. 5. P. i. Vid. et ep. 185. c. xi. n. 48. T. ii.

ⁱ Photinus vero novam hæresim jam ante prævalerat, a Sabellio quidem in unione dis-

sentiens, sed initium Christi a Maria prædicabat. Sulpic. Hist. Sacr. l. ii. c. 37.

^k Photini ergo secta hæc est. Dicit Deum singulum esse ac solitarium, et more Judaico constituendum. Trinitatis plenitudinem negat, neque ullam Dei Verbi, aut ullam Spiritus Sancti putat esse personam. Christum vero hominem tantummodo solitarium adserit, cui principium adscribit ex Maria. Et hoc omnimodo dogmatizat, solam nos personam Dei Patris, et solam Christum hominem colere debere. Hæc ergo Photinus. Vincent. Lirin. Common. cap. 17.

^l Photinus autem infamissimo Nestorio parem sententiam tenuit, Verbum Dei quidem non negans esse in substantia: Sed hoc extrinsecus in isto, qui ex Maria, more communi conjugum, natus est, Jesu inhabitasse peculiariter. &c. Diss. de xii. Anath. n. xvii. T. ii. p. 128. Neque, ut Photinus, initium Filii ex Virgine disputemus. Ambr. de Fide. l. i. c. 1.

as does ^m Hilary. The Eusebians also in the council of Antioch, suppose ⁿ that to be the opinion both of Marcellus and Photinus.

Perhaps, because Photinus was said by some, to have revived the principle of Ebion, Marius Mercatus concluded Photinus to have held the opinion which he ascribes to him. But it is not certain, that all called Ebionites were of that opinion. And they who said, Photinus aimed to revive the heresy of Ebion, might mean no more, than that he was an Unitarian, after the manner of the Jews.

III. We come now to his works. Jerom says, Photinus wrote many volumes. But none of them are now extant. Nor do I recollect any references elsewhere to those mentioned by Jerom, his book against the Gentiles, and to Valentinian. But Socrates ^o speaks of a work written by him after his banishment, against all heresies, and in support of his own opinion. And in like manner Sozomen, that ^p after his banishment Photinus did not desist from maintaining his own sentiments; but published books, both in Greek and Latin, in which he endeavoured to shew the falshood of all other opinions, beside his own.

Rufinus, at the beginning of his Exposition of the Creed, refers to something written upon it by ^q Photinus: but perhaps he does not intend any distinct work.

IV. The character of Photinus being in divers ancient authors, we are led to take some notice of it.

Epiphanius says, he ^r had a fluent way of speaking, and in that respect was wonderfully qualified to impose upon unwary people. Sozomen, that ^s he was naturally eloquent, and fitted to persuade men, and that he gained many to his opinions.

^m Hæc quia Photinus, adversus quem tum conventum erat, negabat, inserta fidei fuerunt: ne quis auderet, non ante Dei Filium quam virginis filium prædicere. &c. Hil. de Synod. n. 50. p. 1181. C. D.

— quæ [hæresis] initium Dei Filii ex partu Virginis mentiebatur. Ibid. n. 61. p. 1183. E.

ⁿ Χριστον δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ — μὴ εἶναι πρὸ αἰῶνων θεολογίας· ἀλλ' ἐκείνῃ Χριστὸν αὐτὸν γεγεννησέναι καὶ Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐξ ἣ τὴν ἡμέτεραν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου σάρκα ἀνελήφει, πρὸ τετρακοσίων ὅλων ἔτων. Ap. Socrat. l. ii. c. 19. p. 99. A.

^o Εἰς τὰς δὲ κατὰ πάσων αἰρεσιῶν, το οὐκ εἶναι μόνον δόγμα παραβέβηκεν. Socr. l. ii. c. 30. p. 126. D. ^p — λόγους τε τῆς ῥωμαίων καὶ ἑλληνῶν φωνῇ συγγραφεύων

ἐξεδίδου, δι' ὧν ἵπτατο, πλεον τῆς αὐτῆς τῶν ἄλλων δόξας ψευδοῦς ἀποφανισί. Soz. l. iv. c. 6. fin. p. 544.

^q Et quidem comperi nonnullos illustrium tractatorum aliqua de his pie et breviter edidisse: Photinum vero hæreticum scio catenus conscripisse, non ut rationum dictorum audientibus explanaret, sed ut simpliciter et fideliter dicta ad argumentum sui dogmatis traheret. Rufin. in Symb. init.

^r Γεγονεῖ υἱὸς ὁ Φωτίνος λαλὸς τῶν ῥημάτων, καὶ ὠξύμμενος τὴν γλῶσσαν· πολλὰς δὲ ἐνανταμμενὸς ἀπάλλαν τῇ τῷ λαῷ παραφροσῇ, καὶ εἰσμοχολοῖα. H. 71. n. 1. p. 829. B.

^s Φυσικῶς δὲ ἔχον ἐν λαῶνι, καὶ πνευματικῶς, πολλὰς εἰς τὴν ὁμοίαν αὐτοῦ δόξας ἐπησάλο. Soz. l. iv. c. 6. p. 542. B.

Vincent of Lerins says, that ¹ Photinus entered upon the bishopric of Sirmium with universal applause; and that he was a man of ready wit, extensive learning, and charming eloquence, and therefore was a great temptation. He spoke and wrote properly and elegantly both in Greek and Latin, of which his remaining works are a proof, there being some in each language. Socrates likewise speaks ² of his skill in the Latin, as well as the Greek tongue, as did Sozomen before quoted.

V. There is no reason to doubt, that Photinus received the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as other Christians did, there being no complaints made against him upon that head.

From Hilary of Poitiers we know, that †† Photinus argued from 1 Tim. ii. 5. Epiphanius says, he boasted ³ of being able to support his doctrine by innumerable texts of scripture. He particularly takes notice of his alleging ⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 47. That Photinus received ⁵ the beginning of St. John's gospel, and allowed the eternity of the Word, though thereby he did not understand the Son of God, is also manifest from Epiphanius.

VI. Though Photinus was deposed and banished, his doctrine was not extinguished: he still had admirers and followers. It is very likely, that the books published by him after his banishment would affect some, especially considering that he was a good writer, as well as a good speaker. The bishops of the council of Aquileia, held in 381, in a synodical epistle to the emperors Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, say, that ⁶

¹ — eos commemoremus, qui multis profectibus, multaque industria præditi, non parvæ tentationi catholicis exsisterunt. Velut apud Pannonias majorum memoria Photinus Ecclesiam Sirmitanam tentasse memoratur: ubi cum magno omnium favore in Sacerdotium fuisset ascitus, & aliquamdiu tamquam catholicus administraret. — Nam erat et ingenii viribus valens, et doctrinæ opibus excellens, et eloquio præpotens: quippe qui utroque sermone copiose et graviter disputaret et scriberet. Quod monumentis librorum suorum manifestatur: quos idem partim Græco, partim Latino sermone composuit. Commemnit. cap. 16.

² Εἰ φύσιν τε διαβῶν τῆ ζωῆς, λόγον συνῆραψεν ἀμφοτέραις γλώσσαις, ὥστε μηδὲ τῆ ῥωμαϊκῆς ἢ αἰκοῖρος. Socr. l. xxx. p. 126. B.

†† Hoc si timemus, deleamus in Apostolo quod dictum est, Mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus, quia ad auctoritatem hæresis suæ Photinus hoc utitur. De Synod. n. 85. p.

1198. E.

³ — καὶ μὴ καυχῆσθαι περὶ τῆς υποθεσίως ἑκατόν μαρτυρίας φέρειν ὁ γενναῖος ἐπηγέλαιος. H. 71. n. i. p. 729. D.

⁴ Φασκὼν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἀποστόλος, εἰρηκεῖ· ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος ἐκ γῆς χοῦρος, καὶ ὁ δευτέρος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ. Ib. n. ii. p. 830. D.

⁵ Καὶ αὐτὸς φησὶ, ἵνα τοὺς λόγους ἀπαρχῆς, ἀλλ' οὐχ' ὅτις Θεὸς γεννημένον. κ. λ. Ib. n. iv. in. p. 31. D.

— Ἀλλὰ, φησὶ, ὥστε διὰ λόγους ὁ ἀνθρώπος παρῆται ὁ βυβλίαι, εἰς πάλιν διὰ τῆς οὐσίας ἐν αὐτῷ λόγος ποιεῖται τὰ πάντα. κ. λ. Ib. p. 832. A. Conf. n. ii. p. 830.

⁶ Photinianos quoque, quos et superiori lege censuisti nullos facere debere conventus, et eam quæ de Sacerdotum Concilio data est congregando removisti; petimus, ut quoniam in Sirmienſi oppido adhuc conventus tentare cognovimus, clementiâ vestrâ interdicta etiam nunc coitione, reverentiam primum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, deinde etiam legibus vestris deferri debeatis. Ap. Ambros. ep. x. n. 12. T. ii. p. 809.

whereas the Photinians still met together at Sirmium, even contrary to a law already made, they intreat farther care to be taken about it. In the law of the emperor Gratian, in 378, giving leave to all manner of sects to hold assemblies, there is an exception of the Eunomians, Photinians, and Manichees. When St. Jerom in his Chronicle says, at this time dies Photinus, from whom the Photinians are called; it is supposed, that there were then some men of that denomination. Augustine^a often mentions them in discourses to the people, which he would not have done, if there were no such men. Gennadius of Marseilles speaks of a Spanish bishop, named Audentius, placed by Cave^a at 360, who wrote a book against the Photinians. From the account which Gennadius gives of that work, it appears, that the Photinians were supposed to have believed our Saviour's nativity of a virgin. We learn from him likewise, that they were sometimes called Bonosians, or Bonosiacs: supposed to be so named from Bonosus, who lived in the latter part of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth century, the place of whose bishopric is not certainly known. Which Bonosus seems to have been of opinion, that Mary^b had other children after the birth of Jesus.

C H A P. XC.

EUSEBIUS, BISHOP OF VERCELLI.

1. EUSEBIUS, born in Sardinia, bishop of Vercell, or Vercelli, in Italy, is placed by Cave, as flourishing about the

^a ——— *μνησθε δὲ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐνδοξασίν, καὶ Φωτινιανῶν, καὶ Μανιχαίων.* Sozr. l. v. c. 2. p. 260. Conf. Soz. l. vii. c. 1. p. 705.

^c Photinus in Galatia moritur. A quo Photinianorum dogma indudum. Chr. p. 187.

^d Vos instruximus, quantam meministis, et meminisse debetis, contra hæreticos Photinianos, qui solum hominem sine Deo esse decernunt; contra Manichæos, qui solum sine homine Deum. In Johan. cap. x. Tr. 47. n. 9. Tom. 3. P. 2. Vid. et in Johan. cap. vi. Tr. 26. n. 5. In Joh. c. xvi. Tr. 96. n. 3. Serm. 252. n. 4. Tom. v. In 1 ep. Joh. cap. iv. Serm. 183. cap. v. n. 8. et alibi.

^e H. L. T. i. p. 224.

^f Audentius, episcopus Hispanus, scripsit

adversus Manichæos, Sabellianos, et Arianos, maxime quoque speciali intentione contra Photinianos, qui nunc vocantur Bonosiaci, librum, quem prætitulavit 'De Fide adversus hæreticos.' In quo ostendit antiquitatem Filii Dei coæternalem Patri fuisse, nec initium Deitatis tunc a Deo Patre accepisse, cum de Maria virgine homo, Deo fabricante, conceptus, et natus est. Gennad. de V. l. cap. 14.

^g Of Bonosus see Tillemont Mem. Ec. T. x. S. Ambroise. Art. 68. et 70. and note 43. et 45. and Mr. Bower's History of the Popes, or Bishops of Rome. Vol. i. p. 263.

^h Vid. Ambros. de Instit. Virg. n. 35. T. ii. p. 357. ed. Bened. et ejusd. Epist. Ibid. p. 1008, 1009.

year

p. 31.

year 35
in the
logue of

2. In

355, he
remove

Upper
by a ma

had all

3. F

sarea up
work of

It is n

Greek

during

home.

letters,
of thos

bishop

pression

as is of

bishop's

Greek

Vid.

Euseb

Urbis Ro

confessio

Seythopol

gatus, sub

reverfus, c

terienfis, c

rat. Mon

regantibu

Vid.

12. in. T

Inter

tum ad

tentio n

sebius V

Sardinia

H. E. l. i

Eusebi

cifer et l

mentis eccl

se ab Ari

ilis. H

Vid. A

p. 312.

Ad Mona

Omni

fuertant ex

Vol

year 354. He died in the time of Valentinian and Valens, in the year 370, or soon after. As he is in Jerom's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers ^a I place the chapter below.

2. In the reign of Constantius, after the council of Milan in 355, he was banished to Scythopolis in Syria, and afterwards removed to Cappadocia, and, as it seems, once ^a more to the Upper Thebais. His and his friends sufferings are mentioned by ^a many writers. When Julian came to be emperor, they ^a had all leave to return home, in 362.

3. He translated the Commentary of his name-sake of Cæsarea upon the Psalms out of Greek into Latin. It is the only work of his, mentioned by Jerom in the fore-cited chapter. It is not unlikely, that in the place of his exile he learned Greek: for Jerom intimates, that the translation was made during that period, and published by him after his return home. This translation is mentioned by Jerom in ^a two of his letters, beside what he says of it in his Catalogue: and in one of those places he says, (if he may be relied upon,) that this bishop of Vercelli left out in his translation some heretical expressions of the original. That translation is now intirely lost, as is observed by Montfauçon ^a, in his Preliminaries to Eusebius's Commentary upon the Psalms published by him in Greek and Latin.

^a Vid. Hieron. Chr. p. 186.

^b Eusebius natione Sardus, et ex Lectore Urbis Romanæ Vercellensis Episcopus, ob confessionem fidei a Constantio Principe Scythopolim, & inde in Cappadociam relegatus, sub Juliano Imperatore ad ecclesiam reversus, edidit Commentarios Eusebii Cæsariensis, quos de Græco in Latinum vertit. Mortuus est Valentiniano & Valente regnantibus. De V. I. cap. 96.

^c Vid. Socr. l. iii. c. 5. Soz. l. v. cap. 12. in. Thdt. l. iii. c. 4. Ruf. l. i. c. 27.

^d Interea Mediolanum convenitur, ubi tum aderat Imperator. Eadem illa contentio nihil invicem relaxabat. Tum Eusebius Vercellensium, et Lucifer a Caralis Sardiniae, Episcopi relegati. Sulp. Sev. H. E. l. ii. cap. 39. al. 55.

Eusebius Vercellensis Episcopus, et Lucifer et Dionysius Caralitanae et Mediolanensis ecclesiarum Episcopi — distantibus inter se ab Ariano, & a Constantio damnati exiliis. Hieron. Chr. p. 184.

Vid. Athanas. ad Imp. Constant. Apol. p. 312. Apol. De fuga sua, p. 322. B. C. Ad Monach. seu Solitar. p. 390.

^e Omnes Episcopi, qui de propriis sedibus fuerant exterminati, per indulgentiam novi

Principis ad ecclesias redeunt. Tunc triumphatorem suum Athanasium Ægyptus excepit. Tunc Hilarius de prælio reverentem Galliarum Ecclesia complexa est. Tunc ad reditum Eusebii lugubres vestes Italia mutavit. Hieron. advers. Lucif. T. iv. p. 301. in.

Sed mortuo Constantio, patrono hæreticorum, Julianus solus tenuit imperium, cuius præcepto omnes Episcopi Catholici de exiliis relaxantur. Faustin. et Marcell. lib. Pr. ap. Bib. P. P. T. v. p. 656. B.

^f Apud Latinos autem Hilarius Pictaviensis, et Eusebius Vercellensis Episcopus, Originem et Eusebium transtulerunt. Ad S. Augustin. ep. 74. al. 89. T. iv. p. 627.

Sit in culpa ejusdem confessionis Vercellensis Eusebius, qui omnium Psalmorum Commentarios hæretici hominis vertit in nostrum eloquium: licet hæretica prætermittens, optima quæque transtulit. Ad Vigil. ep. 36. al. 75. T. 4. p. 276.

^g Hæc porro Eusebii interpretatio jam diu interiit. Nec memini me uspiam ejus vel codicem, vel fragmenta memorataprehendisse. Prælim. in Euseb. Comm. in Ps. cap. 2. n. iii.

4. However, there are still extant some letters, or fragments of letters, supposed to be his. For a particular account of which, and some other things, I refer to divers learned^a moderns.

5. There is a manuscript in the cathedral church of Vercelli, kept there with great respect, and said to have been written by our Eusebius. It is mentioned by¹ Montfauçon in his *Diarium Italicum*. But though he describes its condition, as worn out by time, or much injured by accidents, he does not tell us what it contains. Cave in his article of Eusebius has endeavoured to supply this defect, by adding from Mabillon, that it^k contains the gospels of Matthew and Mark. Nevertheless, there seems reason to think, that it has the four gospels. I have not yet seen the *Evangeliarium Quadruplex Latinæ Versionis antiquæ, seu Veteris Italicæ*, published by Joseph Blanchini at Rome, in 1749, in which he has inserted the whole of this manuscript. But according to the accounts given of that work by two^l journalists, the manuscript of Vercelli has the four gospels. And they observe particularly, that is remarkable for two various readings in St. John's gospel: one of which is an addition at chap. v. 6. the other is an omission, there being wanting the whole history of the woman spoken of chap. viii. 1—11. and the last verse of the preceding chapter.

^a Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. Fabric. ad Hieron. de V. I. Tillem. Mem. T. vii. Du Pin Bib. des Aul. Ec. T. ii. p. 235. ¹ Ecclesiam inde Cathedralem adiimus, in cujus æratio reliquæ insignes — Codicem ibidem inspicimus in charta membranacea tenuissima exaratum. Aiebantque ipsa S. Eusebii manu, qui seculo quarto floruit, descriptum, versionemque ex Græco in Latinum ab eodem adornatam. Nonnulla hinc et inde legi, comperique, versionem esse a Vulgata nostra toto cælo discrepantem. Codex multis in partibus labefaciatus putrefactusque est. Quod casu plus quam vetustate

evenisse discitabant. Narrabantque diu in flumine demersum, indeque erutum fuisse. Alium item librum eodem in sacrario repositum aiebant usui fuisse S. Eusebio Vercelleni. Sed xi. tantum seculi esse arbitror. Montf. Diar. Ital. c. 28. p. 444, 445.

^k Idem fere antea observaverat Cl. Mabillonus [It. Ital. T. i. p. 9.] qui subdit, Codicem Evangelia S. S. Matthæi et Marci continere, membranam situ fere esse corruptam. &c. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 216.

^l See *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*. T. 45. P. 2. Art. x. and the *Universal Librarian*. Vol. i. P. i. p. 1. &c.

C H A P. XCI.

LUCIFER, BISHOP OF CAGLIARI IN SARDINIA.

I. *His history, and testimony to the scriptures.* II. *The request of his followers, Faustinus and Marcellinus.* III. *A book of Faustinus concerning the Trinity.*

I. LUCIFER ^a bishop of Cagliari, or Carali (as the ancients always write it,) in Sardinia, well known in his time, and a sufferer with the fore-mentioned Eusebius in the reign of Constantius, has ^b a place in Jerom's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers: whose chapter therefore I transcribe below.

He seems to have been removed several times. Faustinus and Marcellinus say ^c four times. The last place of his banishment was Thebais, where ^d he was with the fore-mentioned Eusebius at the time of the death of Constantius. He is supposed to have died ^e in 370.

Athanasius, for a while at least, had a great regard ^f for him, and he wrote to him ^g two letters. In the first of which he desires him to send his writings: and by his order they were translated out of Latin into Greek. Faustinus and Marcellinus express themselves, as ^h if they had been translated by Athanasius himself.

Lucifer was always a man of a vehement temper, as appears from his books, written in the time of Constantius, and during his banishment; the titles ⁱ of which I place below. And after

^a Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. Basnag. Ann. 362. n. xx. et alibi. Fabr. ad Hieron. de V. I. cap. 95. et Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 402. Du Pin Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 99. Tillem. Mem. T. vii.

^b Lucifer Caralitanus Episcopus, cum Pancratio et Hilario, Romanæ Ecclesiæ clericis, ad Constantium Imperatorem a Liberio Episcopo pro fide legatus missus, cum nollet sub nomine Athanasii Nicenam damnare fidem, in Palæstinam relegatus, miræ constantiæ et preparati animi ad martyrium, contra Constantium scripsit librum, eique legendum misit. At non multo post sub Juliano Principe reversus Caralis Valentiano regnante obiit. De V. I. cap. 95.

^c — non solum in Sardinia, sed in ipsius quoque quatuor exiliis. Lib. Prec. ap. lib. p. P. T. v. p. 638. F.

Et post aliquot annos beatus Lucifer de

quarto exilio Romam, pergens, ingressus est Neapolim Campaniæ. Ib. p. 636. H.

^d Vid. Socr. H. E. l. iii. cap. 5. Soz. l. v. c. 12. in. Theodoret. l. iii. c. 4.

^e Vid. Hieron. Chr. p. 186.

^f Vid. Athan. Apol. de fuga sua. p. 322. C. Histor. Arian. ad Monach. p. 363, 364.

^g Ap. Athan. Opp. p. 565, 566.

^h Quos quidem libros — suscepit et Athanasius, ut veri vindices, atque in Græcum stilum translulit, ne tantum boni Græca lingua non haberet. &c. Faustin. et Marcell. lib. pr. p. 638. B.

ⁱ Ad Constantium Imp. pro Athanasio. Libri duo. De Regibus Apostolicis. Lib. i. De non conveniendo cum hæreticis. Lib. i. De eo quod moriendum est pro Dei Filio. Lib. i. De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus. Lib. i. Ad Florentium epistola brevis. Ap. Bib. P. P. T. iv. p. 181—250.

his liberty, in the time of Julian, contrary to the sentiment of the catholic bishops in general, he went into ^k a rigid principle, refusing, though ^l it had been determined in a synod at Alexandria in 362, to receive those bishops who in the reign of Constantius had in any measure complied with the Arians, or to communicate with those who received them, upon the acknowledgment of their fault. Jérôm ^m at once represents his principle, and speaks tenderly of Lucifer himself: as ⁿ does also Sulpicius Severus.

Lucifer ^o and his followers, as it seems, were willing to receive the laity who came over from the Arians, upon renouncing their error; but they would not consent that bishops, who had complied with the Arians, should be received as such. They might, upon returning to the catholics, be received as laymen, but they were not any more to officiate in the church.

This occasioned a schism; which, however, never ^p spread very far. Rufinus ^q speaks of it as very small, and Theodoret as ^r extinct in his time. And yet in the year 384, or thereabout, they obtained a ^s rescript from Theodosius, to secure them from persecution, since they made no innovations in the faith. However, they were for some time in several parts of

^k Vid. Hieron. adv. Luciferian. T. iv. Augustin. De Har. cap. 81. T. viii.

^l Pergit interea Eusebius Alexandriam, ibique confessorum concilio congregato—quo pacto post hæreticorum procillas, et perfidiæ turbines, tranquillitas revocaretur Ecclesiæ—discutiunt. Aliis videbatur fidei calore ferventibus, nullum debere ultra in sacerdotium recipi, qui se utcumque hæreticæ communionis contagione maculasset. Sed alii dicebant, melius esse—et ideo sibi rectum videri, ut tantum perfidiæ auctoribus amputatis reliquis sacerdotibus daretur optio, si forte velint, abjurato errore perfidiæ, ad fidem patrum statutaque converti, nec negare aditum redeuntibus, quin potius de eorum conversione gaudere. Rufin. Hist. Ec. l. i. cap. 28. Conf. Socr. l. iii. c. 9. Soz. l. v. c. 13. Theod. l. iii. c. 5.

^m Sed ut dicere cœperamus, post reditum confessorum, in Alexandria postea synodo constitutum est, ut exceptis auctoribus hæreseos, quos error excusare non poterat, penitentes Ecclesiæ sociarentur. Assensus est huic sententiæ Occidens—Ventum est ad asperissimum locum, in quo adversum voluntatem et propositam meum cogor beato Lucifero secus quidquam, quam et illius meritum, et mea humanitas poscit, existimare. Sed quid feciam? Veritas os

referat—In tali articulo Ecclesiæ, in tantæ rabie hyporum, segregatis paucis ovibus, reliquum gregem deseruit. Adv. Lucif. T. iv. p. 302.

ⁿ Cæterum Lucifer, tum Antiochiæ, longe diversâ sententiâ fuit. Nam in tantum eos, qui Animus fuerunt, condemnavit, ut se etiam ab eorum communione seceverit, qui eos sub falsâ factione vel penitentiâ recepissent. Id recte, an perperam constituerit, dicere non audent. S. Sever. H. S. l. ii. c. 48. al. 60.

^o Orthod. Expone mihi, quare licet cum venientem ab Arianis recipias, Episcopum non recipias? Lucifer. Recipio laicum, qui errasse se constet. Et Dominus mavult penitentiam peccatoris quam mortem. Orth. Recipe ergo et Episcopum, qui et errasse se constet. Lucifer. Si errare se constet, cur Episcopus perseverat? Deponat sacerdotium, concedo veniam penitenti. Hieron. adv. Lucifer. T. iv. p. 290.

^p Si Ecclesiâ non habet Christus, aut si in Sardinia tantum habet, nimium pauper est. Hieron. adv. Lucifer. T. iv. p. 298.

^q Rufin. H. E. l. i. cap. 30.

^r Ἀπιστοὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον καὶ ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτοῖς. Theod. H. E. l. iii. c. 5. p. 128. D. ^s Ap. Bib. P. P. T. v. p. 662.

the ' world ; and the authors of the aforesaid request complain particularly, that at Rome, where " they had a bishop named Aurelius, Pope x Damafus disturbed their assemblies, and did all he could to hinder their worship, whether by day or by night.

Lucifer's works have not yet been published with all the advantage that might be wished. Cotelerius ' once intended a more exact edition of them, as thinking they both wanted and deserved it. I shall observe a few things in them, and likewise in the request or petition of the presbyters Faustinus and Marcellinus, his admirers and followers, drawn up in 383, or 384.

Lucifer's writings consist very much of passages of the Old and the New Testament, cited one after another, which he quotes with " marks of the greatest respect. Particularly, he has largely quoted the book of the Acts ; he has likewise largely quoted the " epistle to the Hebrews, the b second epistle of John, and the c epistle of Jude.

Lucifer has quoted almost the whole of the epistle of St. Jude. Undoubtedly he used the ancient Latin version ; and there are in him two readings, which deserve our notice.

Jude, ver. 4, *Denying d the only Lord God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.* He omits the word *God*, saying, *the only Lord* : as do e many Greek manuscripts.

Jude, ver. 7. *and going after strange flesh, are set forth an example.* He reads thus : *and f going after the flesh have been set forth an example by ashes.*

† Sed hæc fraus, hæc atrocitas, adversus fideles in Hispania, et apud Treviros, et Romæ agitur, et in diversis Italiæ regionibus. F. et M. Libr. Prec. p. 658. G.

x Ibid. p. 657. G. H.

x Eodem tempore gravis adversus nos persecutio inhorruerat, infestante Damaso egregio Archiepiscopo, ita ut fidelibus sacerdotibus per dies sacros plebis cæus ad deservendum Christo Deo convocare libere non liceret. Sed quia pro conditione rerum quolibet tempore, vel clam salutis nostræ sacramenta facienda sunt, idem sanctus Presbyter Macarius dat vigilias in quadam domo convocare fraternitatem, ut vel noctu divinis lectionibus fidem plebs sancta roboraret — Denique tendunt insidias clerici Damasi, & ubi cognoverunt, quod sacras vigilias celebraret cum plebe Presbyter Macarius, irruunt cum officialibus in illam domum. &c. Ibid. p. 658. A.

y Vid. Coteler. Annot. ad Constit.

Apost. I. ii. c. 7.

z Quod ita esse, Dominus in sacris Evangeliiis manifestat dicens. De non conveniendo cum hæreticis. Ap. Bib. P. P. T. iv. p. 226. E.

a Beatus Apostolus Paulus dicit ad Hebræos: *Et Moyses quidem fidelis erat in tota domo ejus tanquam servus.* &c. [ad Hebr. cap. iii. et iv.] Ibid. p. 424. E. F. G.

b Idcirco etenim etiam Apostolus in hac dicit secunda epistola: *omnis qui recedit, et non manet in doctrina Christi, Deum non habet. Qui autem manet in doctrina ejus, ille et Patrem et Filium habet.* Ib. p. 226. F. Vid. et ib. B.

c Cum exhortetur Judas, gloriosus Apostolus, frater Jacobi Apostoli — *Judas Jesu Christi servus, frater autem Jacobi.* &c. [Jud. ver. 1—8. ver. 10—13. 18. 20.] Ibid. p. 227. C—E.

d — et qui est dominator noster, et dominus Jesus Christus, eum negantes. — Ib. p. 227. D.

e Vid. Mill. in loc.

f — cum adulterium fecissent, et car-

Both these readings are mightily confirmed by 2 Pet. ii. 6. 10. For at ver. 10. the expression is, *But chiefly them that walk after the flesh*: without the word *strange*. And at ver. 6. *And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes*. Upon these readings should be consulted Mr. Beausobre's notes upon Jude ver. 4. 7. and a Latin letter in the third volume of Mr. La Roche's *Literary Journal*, p. 192, 193.

II. Faustinus and Marcellinus, in their request to the emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius, say, that ^a one thing for which Lucifer was eminent, was the study of the sacred scriptures: that ^b Athanasius commended his writings for the many passages therein collected out of the prophetical, evangelical, and apostolical scriptures. They continually speak with ^c the highest veneration for the writings of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles: and ^d they blame those who teach, or practise any thing contrary to their authority. The epistle to the Hebrews ^e is quoted here very respectfully. Finally, they complain that ^f they were called Luciferians. They say, that Christ is their master, and his doctrine they follow: they ought therefore to be called by no other than the sacred name of Christians, as they hold nothing but what Christ taught by his apostles.

III. Beside that request, there ^g is a book ascribed to Faustinus, Concerning the Trinity, against the Arians, in seven chapters, addressed to the empress Flaccilla, first wife of Theodosius, who died in 385.

I now transcribe below ^h a chapter of Gennadius, giving an

nem secutæ essent, cinis [cineris] propositæ sunt exemplum, ignis æterni pœnam sustinentes. Ibid.

^g Sed et Apostolicus vir Lucifer de Sardinia Caralitæ urbis Episcopus, ob hoc, quod bene esset agnitus per contemptum seculi, per studium sacrarum literarum, per vitæ puritatem — A Romana ecclesia missus est legatus ad Constantium. Lib. Prec. ap. Bib. P. P. T. v. p. 634. C.

^h Idem Athanasius eosdem libros prædicat, ut Prophetarum, et Evangelistarum, atque Apostolorum doctrinis, et pia confessione contextos. Ib. p. 638. E.

ⁱ — illam fidem sine dolo vindicant, quæ apud Nicæam Evangelica atque Apostolica ratione conscripta est. p. 653. F.

Si quidem, dicentibus Divinis Scripturis, doctrina dæmoniorum hæresis est. p. 654. F.

^k — evertentes illa forte statuta, quæ prius adversus eos Prophetica atque Apostolica auctoritate decreverant. p. 656. C. Vid. et p. 658. F.

Annon Scripturæ Divinæ impugnantur, quando cum Episcopis, Filii Dei negotiis, pax Ecclesiæ copulatur? p. 656. H.

^l Credite, religiosissimi Imperatores, beatum Heraclidem unum esse de illo numero sanctorum, de quibus refert Scriptura Divina, dicens: *Circuierunt in melitis et capris pellibus*. — [Hebr. xi. 37, 38.] p. 658. C.

^m Nam et hoc ipsum necessarium est, ut falsi cognomenti discutiamus invidiam, qui nos iactant esse Luciferianos — Sed nobis Christus magister est, cujus doctrinam sequimur, atque ideo cognomenti illius sacra appellatione censemur: ut non aliud jure dici debeamus, quam Christiani, qui nec aliud sequimur, quam quod Christus per Apostolos docuit. p. 858. D.

ⁿ De Trinitate, seu de Fide, adv. Arian. Ap. Bib. P. P. T. v. p. 637—631.

^o Faustinus Presbyter scripsit ad personam Flaccillæ Reginæ adversum Arianos et Macedonianos libros septem: his eos maxime

account

account
few thin

The
scriptur
be prov
epistle
John.
quotes
shews,

1. A
bishop
Jerom
wrote h
several
the fair

2. G
year 37
of Faul
the year
upon, I
therefor
cifer.
that ag

sanctum
et convinc
tantum ad
quem Vale
bos, pro
lino quoda
ostenditur
quia Hila
urbis Rom
culpat, q
quod prev
monem et
Luciferian
pos, qui
communic
apollatas
cap. xvi.

account of Faustinus and Marcellinus. And I shall observe a few things in this book of Faustinus.

The writer expresseth^a the highest respect for the divine scriptures, from which alone all doctrines of religion ought to be proved. Here are quoted^a the Acts of the apostles, the epistle^a to the Hebrews, and^a the Revelation of the apostle John. Moreover Jerom, in his book against the Luciferians, quotes^a the Revelation by way of proof very freely; which shews, that it was received by them.

C H A P. XCII.

GREGORY, BISHOP OF ELVIRA.

1. As he is in Jerom's Catalogue, I add heré Gregory, bishop of Illiberis or Elvira in the province of Bætica in Spain. Jerom^a says, that Gregory was still living in 392, when he wrote his Catalogue; but was of a great age. He had written several treatises in a plain style, and a good book concerning the faith, esteemed more polite than his other works.

2. Gregory is placed by^b Cave, as flourishing about the year 370; but Tillemont^c, from a story told in the Request of Faustinus and Marcellinus, concludes, he was bishop before the year 357. And indeed, if their authority may be relied upon, I should think him to have been bishop in 355; I therefore place him next after Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer. Du Pin^d says, he flourished from 357, to the end of that age.

sanctarum scripturarum testimoniis arguens et convincens, quibus illi pravo sensu abutuntur ad blasphemiam. Scripsit et librum, quem Valentiniano et Arcadio Imperatoribus, pro defensione suorum, cum Marcelino quodam Presbytero, obtulit. Ex quo ostenditur, Luciferiano schismati consensisse, quia Hilarius Pietaviensem, et Damasum urbis Romanæ, Episcopos in eodem libro culpavit, quasi male consuluerint Ecclesiæ, quod prevaricatores Episcopos in communionem et sacerdotium recepissent. Quod Luciferianis ita displicuit, recipere Episcopos, qui in Ariminensi Concilio Arianis communicaverant, quo modo Novatianis apostatas penitentes. Gennad. De V. I. cap. xvi.

libros, et de divina fide divinis utere sermonibus. De Trinit. adv. Arian. cap. i. ib. p. 639. G.

^a Cap. v. p. 647. H.

^a Cap. iii. p. 645. A. et passim.

^a Sed et Apostolus Johannes in Apocalypsi hæc dicit. Cap. iii. p. 645.

^a Contr. Lucifer. T. iv. p. 290. f. et 304. infr. m.

^a Gregorius Bæticus, Illiberi Episcopus, usque ad extremam senectutem diversos mediocri sermone tractatus composuit, et de Fide elegantem librum. Qui hodieque superesse dicitur. De V. L. cap. 105.

^b H. L. T. i. p. 235.

^c Lucifer de Cagliari. Art. viii. Mem. T. vii.

^d Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 106.

^p Inspice potius divinos

3. It is very probable, that this Gregory was a Luciferian. In the fore-cited Request he is spoken of as ^e a man of remarkable firmness: he ^f alone of those who would not comply with the Arians in the time of Constantius was not banished. Again, he ^g is spoken of as an admirable man: and he is honourably mentioned in ^h the Rescript of Theodosius. Moreover, in ⁱ Jerom's Chronicle he is joined with others, who never complied with the Arians.

4. Whether the book concerning the faith, mentioned by Jerom, be now extant, is somewhat doubtful. There is a tract with a like title, called ^k Gregory Nazianzen's 49th Oration, and usually joined also ^l with the works of St. Ambrose; which ^m Quesnell thinks to be the work of Gregory of Illiberis: others ⁿ say, it is not his. It is however the work of some ancient writer. Concerning this point several moderus may ^o be consulted.

5. I scarce need make any extracts out of this treatise. I only observe, that the scriptures of the Old and New Testament are here quoted with great respect. The ^p book of the Acts is here quoted; and here occurs the phrase, which we have sometimes observed formerly, of ^q the Lord's scriptures; meaning thereby, more particularly, the scriptures of the New Testament.

C H A P. XCIII.

PHŒBADIUS, BISHOP OF AGEN.

1. SAYS Jerom, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers: ^c Phœbadius ^a bishop of Agen in Gaul, has published a book

^e Vid. Libr. Pr. p. 654. H. et 655. A.

^f Inde est, quod solus Gregorius ex numero vindicantium integram fidem, nec in fugam versus, nec passus exilium, cum unusquisque timeret de illo ulterius vindicare. Ibid. p. 655. E.

^g Jam quantus vir Lucifer fuerit, cum illum admiraretur et Gregorius, qui apud cunctos admirabilis est. p. 658. F. Vid. et p. 657. E. ^h Ibid. p. 661. D.

ⁱ Lucifer Caralitanus Episcopus moritur, qui cum Gregorio Episcopo Hispaniarum, et Philone Libyz, nunquam se Arianae miscuit pravitati. Chr. p. 186.

^k Ap. Greg. Naz. Opp. T. i. p. 726—736. ^l De Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos. In Append. Opp. S. Ambros.

T. ii. p. 346—358. ed. Bened.

^m Vid. Diff. xiv. in S. Leon. M. opp. § vii. ⁿ Vid. Benedictin. Monitum. p. 346.

^o Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 235. in Greg. Baet. Fabr. ad Hieron. de V. I. cap. 105. et Bib. Lat. T. iii. p. 495. Tillem. Mem. T. vii. Lucif. de Cagl. An. i.

^p Et Spiritum sicut ignem esse, Apostolorum Acta declarant. Apud Greg. Naz. T. i. p. 735. in. ^q Sed ego probe,

Deum de Deo—in Scripturis Dominici contineri. Ibid. p. 730. fin.

^a Phœbadius, Agenni Galliarum Episcopus, edidit contra Arianos librum. Dicuntur et ejus alia esse opuscula, quæ nondum vidi. Vivit usque hodie decrepita senectute. De V. I. cap. 108.

^c against

against the Arians. He is said to have written some other small pieces, which I have not yet seen. He is still living, at a great age.

2. There is honourable mention made of Phœbadius by Sulpicius Severus^b in his Sacred History. The book against the Arians is still extant. The author is placed by Cave^d at the year 359, the supposed time of writing that work.

3. I need say nothing more of it, than that the author quotes very frequently the generally received books of scripture. There is supposed to be a reference to the epistle to the Hebrews, but it is not clear: a reference to the Revelation may be reckoned undoubted.

4. Throughout the whole work Phœbadius shews great respect for the holy scriptures. The bishops of the Nicene council, he says, first consulted the sacred volumes, and then declared their faith. He himself^h professes a strong resolution, not to forsake the doctrine taught by the prophets, the gospels, and the apostles.

C H A P. XCIV.

CAIUS MARIUS VICTORINUS AFER.

1. CAIUS MARIUS VICTORINUS^a, born in Africa, says Jerom^b, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, taught rhetoric at Rome, in the time of the emperor Constantius. And in his old age embracing the Christian religion, he wrote some books against the Arians, which are so obscure, that

^b L. ii. cap. 44. al. 59.

^c Phœbadii Episcopi liber contra Arianos. Ap. Bib. P. P. T. iv. p. 300—305.

^d Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 217. Conf. Fabr.

ad Hieron. de V. I. c. 108. et Bib. Lat.

T. iii. p. 420. Du Pin Bib. T. ii. p. 107.

Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. vi. Les Ariens art. 72.

^e Vid. p. 304. F. Bib. P. P. 74. T. iv.

^f Quod Johannes in Filio recognoscens:

Qui est, inquit, et qui erat, et qui venturus

est, Omnipotens. Ibid. p. 303. D.

^g Quid egistis, o beatæ memoriæ viri, qui ex omnibus orbis partibus Nicæam congregati, et sacris voluminibus pertractatis, perfectam fidei catholicæ regulam circumspicere sermone fecistis. Ib. p. 301. C.

^h Hoc credimus, hoc tenemus, quia hoc accepimus a Prophetis. Hoc nobis Evangelia locuta sunt, hoc Apostoli tradiderunt, hoc Martyres passione confessi sunt. Ib. p. 305. B.

^a Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 228. Fabr. ad Hieron. de V. I. c. 101. et Bib. Lat. T. iii. p. 421. et seqq. Du Pin Bib. T. ii. p. 100. Tillem. Mem. T. x. dans S. Simplicien.

^b Victorinus, natione Afer, Romæ sub Constantio Principe Rhetoricam docuit. Et in extrema senectute Christi se tradens fidei scripsit adversus Arium libros more dialecticis valde obscuros, qui nisi ab eruditissimis non intelliguntur, et commentarios in Apostolum. De V. I. c. 101.

they

* they are understood by the learned only. He likewise wrote
 * Commentaries upon the apostle Paul's epistles.

2. Victorinus is mentioned by Jerom several times elsewhere. In * his Chronicle he says, that Victorinus had taught rhetoric at Rome with so much reputation, that he had the honour of a public statue, set up in Trajan's forum. In * the preface to his Commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians, Jerom again speaks of the above-mentioned Commentary upon the apostle Paul; and he represents Victorinus as a very indifferent interpreter of scripture.

3. Some have thought, that Jerom studied rhetoric under Victorinus; but as Jerom says nothing of it, though he had a fair occasion, when he mentions Victorinus in his Chronicle; it is more probable, that * he never was his scholar.

4. I choose to place at the bottom of the page a part of what Augustine writes concerning this illustrious convert: That * after having long been an idolater, and taught rhetoric at Rome with great applause, and had his statue erected in the Roman forum, he in his old age embraced, and made open profession of the Christian religion, at a time when the greatest part of the Roman nobility were heathens. He particularly observes, that by reading the scriptures Victorinus had been convinced of the truth of the Christian religion. He moreover says, that * when the emperor Julian published his edict,

* Victorinus Rhetor, et Donatus Grammaticus, Præceptor incus, Romæ insignes habentur. E quibus Victorinus etiam statuem in Foro Trajani meruit. Chr. p. 184.

4 Non quod ignorem Caium Marium Victorinum, qui Romæ pueros rhetoricam docuit, edidisse commentarios in Apostolum: sed quod occupatus ille eruditione secularium literarum Scripturas omnino sanctas ignoraverit: Et nemo potest, quamvis eloquens, de eo bene disputare quod nesciat. Pr. in Galat. T. iv. p. 222. * Vid. Fabr. not. (c) ad Hieron. de V. I. c. 101.

* Ubi autem commemoravi legisse me quosdam libros Platoniorum, quos Victorinus quondam Rhetor urbis Romæ, quem Christianum defunctum esse audieram, in Latinam linguam translulisset, gratulatus est mihi. [Simplicianus.]—Deinde, ut me exhortaretur ad humilitatem Christi. —Victorinum ipsum recordatus est, quem Romæ cum esset familiarissime noverat. Deque illo mihi narravit quod non silebo. —Quemadmodum ille doctissimus senex, et omnium liberalium doctrinarum peritissimus: quippe Philosophorum tam multa

legerat, et dijudicaverat, et dilucidaverat: doctior tot nobilium Senatorum, qui etiam ob insigne præclari magisterii, quod civis hujus mundi eximium putant, statum in Romano Foro, meruerat et acceperat, usque ad illam ætatem venerator idolorum, sacrorumque sacrilegorum particeps, quibus tunc tota fere Romana Nobilitas infusa, inspirabat populo jam et omnigenum Deorum monstra, —quæ iste senex Victorinus tot annos ore terrefacto defendit: non erubuerit esse puer Christi tui. —Legebatur, sicut ait Simplicianus, sanctam Scripturam, omnesque Christianas literas investigabat studiosissime et perscrutabatur. Et dicebat Simpliciano, non palam, sed secretim, et familiarius: Noveris me esse Christianum. &c. Aug. Confess. l. viii. c. 2. n. 1. et 2. T. i.

* Postea quam vero et illud addidit, quod Imperatoris Juliani temporibus lege data prohibiti sunt Christiani docere literaturam, et oratoriam: quam legem ille amplexus loquacem scholam deferere maluit, quam verbum tuum, quo linguas infantum facis disertas. Ibid. c. 4. n. 10.

forbidding

forbidding
 other b
 school
 pliances
 been in
 well ac
 Rome,
 an open
 version.

5. T
 still b ex
 against
 the sam
 And his
 them at
 in some

6. I
 books a
 in num

7. M
 quently
 epistle t

8. H
 with th

9. H
 but be
 appear

10. I
 the mo
 to the c
 appreh

* Apud
 * Et i
 [Petrus,]
 Arian. l. i.
 * Lectu
 Christo.
 passim.
 ciuit: Et
 p. 280. C
 l. i. p. 2
 l. iii. p. 2
 in omnib
 nisi de C
 obfessum
 tali appar

forbidding Christians to teach grammar, and rhetoric, and other branches of polite literature, Victorinus shut up his school, rather than purchase a liberty of teaching by compliances unbecoming a Christian. All which Augustine had been informed of by Simplician, bishop of Milan, who was well acquainted with Victorinus, and had often seen him at Rome, and was a principal instrument of persuading him to an open profession of the Christian religion if not of his conversion.

5. The books against the Arians, mentioned by Jerom, are still ^a extant. Beside which, we have also a letter or treatise against the Manichees, and some other small tracts, written in the same style, and generally reckoned works of Victorinus. And his Commentaries upon St. Paul's epistles, upon some of them at least, are supposed to be still in being, in manuscript, in some libraries; but they have not been yet published.

6. I shall now observe a few things, chiefly taken out of the books against the Arians, which, as we now have them, are four in number.

7. Most of the books of the New Testament are here frequently quoted, particularly the ¹ Acts of the apostles, the ² epistle to the Hebrews, and ¹ the Revelation.

8. He several times quotes ^m the epistle to the Ephesians, with that title.

9. He says, that ⁿ Paul in all his epistles, does nothing else but bear testimony to Christ; and that to him alone Christ appeared after his ascension.

10. He says, that ^o the Holy Ghost may be not unfitly styled the mother of Jesus. He has divers ^p other expressions relating to the doctrine of the Trinity, which are not agreeable to the apprehensions of learned divines of late times. Nor, indeed,

^a Apud Bib. P. P. T. iv. p. 253. &c.

¹ Et in Actis Apostolorum et ipse [Petrus,] et Lucas qui scripsit de iis. Adv. Arian. l. iii. p. 280. B.

² Lectum apud Paulum ad Hebræos de Christo. Adv. Ar. l. ii. p. 272. G. & passim.

¹ Item in Apocalypsi ipse dicit: Et habeo claves mortis et inferi. l. iii. p. 280. C.

^m Paulus ad Ephesios. l. i. p. 254. H. Item ipse ad Ephesios. l. iii. p. 280. C.

ⁿ Paulus tamen in omnibus epistolis suis quid aliud agit, nisi de Christo testimonium dicit? Et post obitum Christi solus Christum vidit, et soli apparuit. L. iii. p. 280. A.

^o Natus est Filius, *Λόγος* qui sit, hoc est vita virtute patria, generante intelligentia, hoc est quod esse omnium quæ sunt veluti æternum fontem. Non fallatur ergo, si quis subintellegerit Sanctum Spiritum matrem esse Jesu. L. i. p. 270. B.

^p Pater ergo, Filius, Spiritus Sanctus, Deus, *Λόγος* *παράκλητος*, unum sunt, quod substantialitas, vitalitas, beatitudo, silentium: Sed apud se loquens silentium, verbum, verbi verbum. Quid etiam est voluntas Patris, nisi silens Verbum? Hoc ergo modo cum Verbum Pater sit, et Filius Verbum, id est, sonans Verbum atque operans. L. iii. p. 278. A.

is he very intelligible; but he seems to say, that the Word silent is the Father, or, the will of the Father; and the Word speaking, or operating, is the Son. Which may induce some to recollect what was said formerly ^a of Sabellianism, in the chapter of Dionysius bishop of Alexandria.

C H A P. XCV.

APOLLINARIUS, BISHOP OF LAODICEA.

- I. *His time and history.* II. *His works, particularly his Commentaries upon the scripture, and his writings in the defence of the Christian religion.* III. *His peculiar opinions in the latter part of his life.* IV. *His works relating to those opinions.* V. *Scriptures received by him.* VI. *His character.*

I. SAYS Jerom, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers: 'Apollinarius ^a bishop of Laodicea in Syria, son of a presbyter of the same name, in his younger days employed himself chiefly in grammatical studies. Afterwards he published innumerable volumes upon the holy scriptures, and died in the time of the emperor Theodosius. His thirty books against Porphyry are still extant, and are esteemed the most valuable of all his works.'

Apollinarius is placed by Cave ^b as flourishing about the year 370; but ^c Tillemont thinks, he was bishop of Laodicea in 362, at the latest. For certain, I think, he may be reckoned to have flourished in the time of the emperor Julian, and afterwards.

It has been questioned, whether Apollinarius ever was bishop; but ^d Tillemont, ^e Basnage, and ^f some others, are clear, that he obtained that dignity in the church: as is said by Jerom in the chapter just transcribed, and also ^g in his Chronicle, and by ^h Rufinus in his Ecclesiastical History. He died in the reign of Theodosius, as Jerom said just now; and probably,

^a See Vol. iii. p. 76.

^a Apollinarius Laodicensis Syriæ Episcopus, patre Presbytero, magis Grammaticis in adolescentia operam dedit. Et postea in sanctas Scripturas innumerabilia scribens sub Theodosio Imperatore obiit. Exstant ejus adversus Porphyrium triginta libri, qui inter cætera ejus opera vel maxime pro-

bantur. De V. I. cap. 104.

^b H. L. T. i. p. 250.

^c Les Apollinaristes. Art. v. Mem. T. vii.

^d Ubi supra.

^e Ann. 364. n. xi.

^f Vid. Cav. ubi sup. Du Pin Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 125. and 127.

^g Chr. p. 186.

^h Ruf. H. E. l.

ii. cap. 20.

not long after the beginning of it, in 382, or soon after. For Epiphanius in 376 or 377, calls him¹ an old man, and a venerable old man: and Suidas says^k, that he lived in the time of Constantius, and Julian the apostate, to the reign of Theodosius the great, being contemporary with Basil and Gregory, those admirable men of Cappadocia, with whom also he was acquainted.

Apollinarius the father, as we learn from¹ Socrates, was an Alexandrian. From thence he went to Berytus, where he taught Greek learning: after that he removed to Laodicea, and married, still continuing to teach grammar. Here likewise he was made presbyter, and his son reader; who, as we suppose, was at length ordained bishop of that city. And moreover, it is observed^m by ecclesiastical writers, that the elder Apollinarius and his son were both intimate with Epiphanius, an heathen sophist at Laodicea; andⁿ the son studied under him. Suidas adds, that^o he was acquainted with Libanius.

II. As Jerom in the chapter already transcribed says, that Apollinarius, bishop of Laodicea, published many volumes upon the scriptures, and in another place reckons him among those who^p had left monuments of their diligence in studying the scriptures; I am led, agreeably to my design, to give an account of his works. Moreover, we perceive, that^q Jerom, when young, often heard Apollinarius preach at Antioch; and he seems to have been then well pleased with his explanations of the scriptures, though he did not approve of every thing said by him. His Apology for the Christian religion against Porphyry affords another reason, why I should give a more distinct account of this author's works, than I do of most others of so late an age.

1. The emperor Julian^r in the year 362, published an edict, forbidding the Christians to teach the Greek learning, or read

¹ Ο περιβόητος, και σιμωνωπριτης. κ. λ. H. 77. n. ii. p. 996. — τον γεροντα. id. n. xxvi. p. 1031.

^k — γινωσκων εν ημεραις Κωνσταντιου και Ιουλιανου του παραβολου, και εως της αρχης Θεοδοσιου του μεγαλου, συλχηρονος βασιλευς και Γρηγοριου, των εκ Καππαδοκιας θυμαζωμενων. Επεισο δε γνωριμος αμφοτερων, και Λιβανου, και αλλων τινων. Suid. V. Απολλινάριος.

¹ Socr. l. ii. cap. 46.

^m Socr. ibid. Sozom. l. vi. cap. 25.

ⁿ Διδασκαλος δε αυτου χρονιστος Απολλινάριος, ου γαρ νεος ην. Soz. ib. p. 672. A.

^o See before note k.

^p Quod e

contrario de Theodoro, Acacio, Apollinario possumus dicere. Et tamen omnes in explanationibus Scripturarum sudoris sui nobis memoriam reliquerunt. Ad Minerv. et Alex. ep. 152. Vid. T. iv. P. i. p. 220.

^q Dum essem juvenis, miro discendi ferebar ardore — Apollinarium Laodicenum audiavi Antiochie frequenter, et colui. Et quum me in sanctis scripturis erudiret, numquam illius contentiosum dogma suscepi. Ep. 40. al. 64. Ad Pamm. et Ocean. T. iv. P. 2. p. 342.

^r Vid. Pagi. Ann. 362. n. xxxix.

their authors. At * this time, says Socrates, the two Apollinarii before-mentioned were very useful to the Christians: the elder wrote a grammar in a Christian form, and put the books of Moses into heroic verse, and all the other books of the Old Testament into various kinds of metre, used by the Greek poets. The † younger, who was an excellent writer, put the gospels and the apostolical doctrine, into dialogues, after the manner of Plato.

2. Sozomen, without ascribing any works to the father, says of Apollinarius of Syria, that † employing his extensive learning and happy genius suitably to the occasion, for supplying to Christians the want of Homer, he wrote the Jewish Antiquities to the reign of Saul, in four and twenty books, giving to each book the name of a Greek letter, as Homer had done. He also wrote comedies in imitation of Menander, tragedies in imitation of Euripides, and lyric poems after the manner of Pindar, still taking his subjects from the sacred scriptures. To these works, as well as to some other, Jerom may be supposed to refer, when he says in his Chronicle; at † this time Apollinarius bishop of Loadicea, composes many writings relating to our religion. Among the poems of Gregory Nazianzen † is a tragedy, intitled *Χριστος πασχων*, Christ suffering: which † some suppose to have been written by Apollinarius. Others † think that opinion to be without foundation, and that it is neither Gregory's, nor Apollinarius's.

3. Beside these, we can trace out from ancient writers, particularly from Jerom, commentaries of Apollinarius upon most parts of scripture.

4. He wrote, as we learn from Jerom, a † Commentary upon the whole book of Psalms: I place the whole passage below, though it contains more than we now immediately want. But it will be acceptable to some of my readers, Jerom there mentioning together six antient Greek writers, who had commented upon the whole book of Psalms, beside what had been done by others, who had explained some psalms only.

* Socr. l. iii. c. 16.

† Ο δε νεώτερος Απολλινάριος, εν προς το λειπειν παρισκευασμενος, τα ευαγγελια, και τα αποστολικά δογματα, εν τω δια λεγειν εξεβηλο, καθα και αλλων παρ' αλλων. κ. λ. Ib. p. 187.

‡ Soz. l. v. c. 18. p. 623.

† Apollinarius Laodiceus Episcopus multimodo religionis nostrae scripta componit. Chr. p. 186.

‡ Ap. Gregor. Naz. Opp. T. ii. p. 253—298.

† Balsag. Ann. 390. n. x. Cav. H. L. p. 248. De Greg. Naz.

‡ S. Greg.

Naz. art. 110. Tillem. Mem. T. ix.

‡ — et maxime in explanatione Psalmorum, quos apud Græcos interpretati sunt multis voluminibus, primus Origenes, secundus Eusebius Cæsariensis, tertius Theodorus Heracleotes, quartus Asterius Scythopolitanus, quintus Apollinarius Laodiceus, sextus Didymus Alexandrinus. Feruunt et diversorum in paucos psalmos opuscula. Sed nunc de integro Psalmorum corpore dicimus. Ad Augustin. ep. 74. al. 89. T. iv. P. 2. p. 627. in.

5. There is still extant^b a Paraphrase of the Psalms, in hexameter verse, generally ascribed to our Apollinarius, and generally well esteemed, and the only intire work of his remaining: and I suppose it may be different from the commentary just mentioned in Jerom.

6. In his Commentary upon the book of Ecclesiastes, Jerom several times^c mentions explications that had been given by Apollinarius.

7. In the preface to his Commentaries upon Isaiah, Jerom gives a character of Apollinarius's commentaries, representing them^d to be exceeding short, quite passing over some things, and touching only upon others.

8. In the preface to his Commentaries upon the book of Daniel, Jerom says, that^e Apollinarius, in the 26th book of his work against Porphyry, which was a very long book, considered the objections which Porphyry had made to the book of Daniel. Here likewise Jerom says, that^f Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Apollinarius, and divers others of the Greek catholic writers, rejected the stories of Susanna, Bell and the Dragon, as not extant in Hebrew; and therefore Eusebius and Apollinarius in their answers to Porphyry insisted, that they were not obliged to take notice of his objections against Daniel, founded upon a supposition, that they were a part of his book, when indeed they were of no authority, nor a part of sacred scripture.

9. It seems probable, that beside what Apollinarius wrote in favour of Daniel's prophecies in his work against Porphyry, he also wrote a commentary upon that prophet. For Jerom^g

^b Psalmorum Davidicorum Metaphrasis. De qua Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 666, 667. Exstat Græce et Latine in Bib. Patr. Morell. Par. 1644. T. xiv. p. 162—298. Et alibi.

^c Laodiceus Interpres res magnas brevi sermone exprimere contendens, more sibi solito etiam hic loquutus est. In Ec. cap. iv. T. 2. p. 741. Vid. et in cap. xii. 3. Ibid. p. 785. in.

^d Apollinarius autem more suo sic exponit omnia, ut universa transcurrat, et punctis quibusdam atque intervallis, immo compendiis grandis viæ spacia prætervolet: ut non tam Commentarius quam Indices capitulorum nos legere credamus. Pr. in Is. T. iii. p. 6.

^e Cui solertissime responderunt Eusebius Cæsariensis, — Apollinarius quoque uno grandi libro, hoc est vicessimo-sexto, — Pr. in Dan. T. iii. p. 1071.

^f Cui et Eusebius et Apollinarius pari

sententia responderunt: Susannæ, Belisique ac Draconis fabulas non contineri in Hebraico.—Unde et nos ante annos plurimos, quum verteremus Daniele, has visiones obelo prænotavimus, significantes eos in Hebraico non haberi. Et miror quosdam *ματαισιμους* indignari mihi, quasi ego decurtaverim librum: quum et Origenes, et Eusebius, et Apollinarius, alique ecclesiastici viri et doctores Græcæ, has, ut dixi, visiones non haberi apud Hebræos fateantur: nec se debere respondere Pophyrio pro his quæ nullam Scripturæ sanctæ auctoritatem præbeant. Pr. in Dan. T. iii. p. 1074.

^g Apollinarius autem Laodiceus, omni præteritorum temporum se liberans quaestione, vota extendit in futurum, & periculose de incertis profert sententiam. Quæ si forte hi qui post nos vîcturi sunt statuto tempore completa non viderint, aliam solutionem quaerere compellentur, & magis makes

makes remarks upon his explication of Dan. ix. 27. and quotes a long passage from him. From whence (if I may observe it by the way) it appears, that Apollinarius computed our Lord's ministry to have lasted somewhat more than two years, there being in it, according to St. John's gospel, three passovers, as he says.

10. In the preface to his Commentaries upon Hosea, Jerom says, that ^a Apollinarius in his younger days, wrote short commentaries upon all the prophets; that afterwards he was desired by his friends to write more fully upon Hosea. But still even in this latter work, Jerom finds the fault of too great brevity.

11. Some learned men have been of opinion, that Apollinarius published a new Greek translation of the books of the Old Testament, composed out of the several Greek versions that had been made before. This supposition is chiefly built upon two passages of Jerom, which ⁱ I transcribe below. But it seems to me, that Humphry Hody has shewn, that ^k nothing more is intended, than that in his commentaries upon the scriptures, and his explications of them, Apollinarius without good judgment, mingled all the former translations of the Old Testament. Nevertheless Fabricius, either not attending to what Hody has said, or not being convinced by it, in his enumeration of the works of our author, reckons ^l this for one,

trum erroris arguere. Dicit ergo, ut verbum verbo interpreter, ne calumniam videar facere non dicenti. — Tricesimo enim, juxta Evangelistam Lucam, anno ætatis suæ cepit in carne Dominus evangelium prædicare: et juxta Johannem Evangelistam per tria paschata duos postea implevit annos. In Dan. ix. T. iii. p. 1114.

^a — Apud Græcos reperi Apollinarium Laodicenum, qui quum in adolescentia sua breves et in hunc et in alios Prophetas commentarios reliquisset, tangens magis sensus quam explicans, rogatus est postea, ut in Osee plenius scriberet. Qui liber venit in nostras manus. Sed et ipse nimia brevitate ad perfectam intelligentiam lectorum ducere non potest. Præf. in Osee. T. iii. p. 1235.

ⁱ Origines in omnibus libris suis post septuaginta Interpretes, Judæorum translationes explanat et edisserit. Eusebius quoque et Didymus idem faciunt. Prætermitto Apollinarium, qui bono quidem studio, sed non secundum scientiam, de omnium translationibus in

unum vestimentum pannos alluere conatus est, et consequentiam Scripturarum nos et regula veritatis, sed ex suo judicio texere. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. T. iv. p. 433.

Cujus [Symmachi] interpretationem Laodiceus sequutus nec Judæis placere potest, nec Christianis: dum et ab Hebræis procul est, et sequi Septuaginta Interpretes designatur. In Ecclef. xii. 5. T. ii. p. 785. m.

^k Apollinarium, Apollinarii F. Episcopum Laodiceæ editionem quandam maximam Bibliorum ex Interpretum omnium Versionibus constatam elaborasse existimant eruditi. — Sed falluntur omnes. Loquitur enim Hieronymus non de ulla Bibliorum editione ab Apollinario confecta, sed de illius tantum Scripturarum explanationibus, in quibus sine ullo judicio translationes omnes commiscuerat, secutusque fuerat. Hol. de Bib. Text. Origen. l. iv. c. 3. p. 691. Conf. l. iii. p. 318.

^l Versio Græca librorum V. T. contexta ex variis interpretationibus, præcipue Symmachi. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 664.

A Greek

A Greek Translation of the Books of the Old Testament: and refers to ^m R. Simon, as of the same opinion.

12. Here I would take a part of Suidas's article concerning Apollinarius. He says, he ^a put the whole Jewish scripture into heroic verse; he also wrote epistles, and many commentaries upon the sacred scriptures. After which, Suidas quotes a long passage of Philostorgius, which is also briefly taken notice of by Photius, in his extracts ^o out of Philostorgius's Ecclesiastical History. Comparing Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Apollinarius, and speaking of them all as eminent writers in their way, he observes to the advantage of Apollinarius, that ^p his style was best for a commentator of scripture, and that he understood Hebrew.

13. There is however a passage of Jerom, where he is supposed to refer to ^q Apollinarius; which may occasion a doubt, whether he had any, or at least a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew. And ^r as it has some respect to the point just now spoken of, his making a new Greek version of the Old Testament, I have transcribed it at large.

We now proceed,

14. In the ^s preface to his Commentary upon St. Matthew, Jerom speaks of a commentary of Apollinarius upon that gospel; and he refers to it ^t in his own comment.

15. Apollinarius ^u is mentioned by him together with others, who had explained the first epistle to the Corinthians.

16. He wrote also upon ^x the whole, or a part of the epistle to the Galatians.

17. His Commentary ^y upon the epistle to the Ephesians is mentioned by Jerom several times.

^a Hist. Cr. du V. T. l. ii. ch. 10. p. 242.

^b Οὗτος ἑρμηνεύει — καὶ δὲ ἡρώων ἔργων παρὰ τῆς ἑβραίων γραφῆς. Ἑρμηνεύει δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολάς, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ εἰς τὴν γραφὴν ὑπομνήματα. Suid. V. Ἀπολλινάριος.

^c Philost. H. E. l. viii. c. 11.

^d Οὗτος γὰρ δὴ καὶ τῆς ἑβραϊδος διαλέκτου ἰκανὸς οἷος τε ἦν. κ. λ. Ap. Suid. ib.

^e Vid. Hod. ubi supra. p. 631.

^f Primum enim magnorum sumtum est et infinita difficultatis, exemplaria posse habere omnia: deinde etiam qui habuerint, et Hebræi sermonis ignari sunt, magis errabant, ignorantes quis e multis verius dixerit. Quod etiam sapientissimo cuidam puer apud Græcos accidit, ut interdum Scripturæ sensum relinquens uniuscujusque interpretis sequeretur errorem. Prol. in libr. Eccl. ex Hebr. conversi. T. i. p. 1107.

Et Conf. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. p. 427. infr. m.

^g Legisse me fateor — Apollinarisque Laodicensi, ac Didymi Alexandrini. Pr. in Matt. T. iv. P. i. p. 3.

^h Vid. in Matt. ib. p. 115. f.

ⁱ Origenes, — Eusebius Cæsariensis, Didymus, Apollinarius, latissime hanc epistolam interpretati sunt. Ad Pamm. ep. 31. al. 52. T. iv. p. 243. f.

^k Prætermitto Didymum videntem meum, et Laodicenum, de Ecclesia nuper egressum, qui et ipsi nonnullos super hac re commentarios reliquerunt. Pr. in Gal. T. iv. P. i. p. 222. Conf. ad August. ep. 74. al. 89. T. iv. P. ii. p. 619.

^l Ego enim in Commentariis ad Ephesios sic Origenem, et Didymum, et Apollinarium sequutus sum, — ut fidei meæ non amitterem veritatem. Adv. Ruf. l. i. T. iv. p. 365.

18. He also wrote ² upon the whole, or a part of the first epistle to the Thessalonians.

19. In the chapter of the Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, transcribed above, Jerom mentions and commends our author's work against Porphyry; as he does also in ³ several other places. This work is particularly mentioned by Suidas: and we took some notice of it ⁴ formerly.

20. Sozomen, speaking of the works of Apollinarius, says: There ⁵ is also a valuable work of his, addressed to the emperor himself and the Greek philosophers, intitled *Of the Truth*, in which, by reason alone, without alleging the divine scriptures, he shewed, that they did not think rightly of the Deity. And it was said, that upon occasion of this book, Julian wrote a letter to some Christian bishops to this purpose: 'I have read, ⁶ understood, and condemned.' To which he received this answer, 'You have read, but you did not understand; if you ⁷ had understood, you would not have condemned.' Some ascribe ⁸ this work to Basil of Cappadocia: but however that be, says Sozomen, the writer deserves to be admired both for his courage and learning.

Whether this be the same as the work against Porphyry, or different from it, is not clear. Fabricius ⁹ thinks it to be a different work, and written before the other. He imagines, that Apollinarius, provoked at Julian's remark, was induced after this short performance to write the large work against Porphyry.

21. Beside all these, Apollinarius wrote divers books against those called heretics.

In epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios tria Origenes scripsit volumina. Didymus quoque et Apollinarius propria opuscula edidit. Quos ego, vel transferens vel imitans, quid in prologo ejusdem operis scripserim, subijciam. &c. Adv. Ruf. ib. p. 373. Conf. Pr. in ep. ad Eph. T. iv. P. i. p. 322. f.

² Ad Minerv. et Alex. de eo quod omnes quidem dormiemus. &c. Vid. T. iv. P. i. p. 216. et conf. ib. p. 211. et 220.

³ Apollinarius contra Porphyrium egregia scripsit volumina. Ad Pamm. et Ocean. ep. 41. al. 65. T. iv. P. ii. p. 345. Vid. ib. p. 342. Vid. et Pro. libr. adv. Jovinian. Apol. ep. 30. al. ep. 50. p. 236. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. T. iv. p. 433. in. Ad Magn. ep. 43. p. 655. Pr. Comm. in Dan. T. iii.

⁴ See Vol. iv. p. 205.

⁵ Οτι αληθης δε και προς αυτον τον βασιλεα ητοιμας παρ' ελλησι φιλοσοφους εστιν αυτος ο λογος, ον υπειρ αληθειας επιγραφεν' ειναι και

δολος της των ιερων λογων μαρτυριας εις αυτους αποκαταστησας τα διεντες επι της φρονειν. Τα δε γαρ επιλαμβανει ο βασιλεως τοις τοις διαπραπτουσιν επισκοποις επιτιθεσθαι Ανεστην, εστην, και κατεστην—αληθεια δ' καιον ανδρειας και παιδευσεως του γραμματισ. Soz. l. v. c. 18. p. 624.

⁶ Others understand Sozomen differently, after this manner: that some ascribed this saying or answer to Basil. Hanc responsionem Basilio M. non Apollinari plerisque tribuisse, Sozomen. narrat. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 662.

⁷ Videtur autem inde Apollinaris permotus esse, ut post brevem istum libellum editum, jussu deinde opere libros, quorum maxima erat apud Ethnicos auctoritas, Tyrii Philosphii Porphyrii adversus Christianos confutaret. Agre enim assentior viris doctis, qui libros XXX contra Porphyrium cum λογος confundunt. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 662.

Vincent

Vincent of Lerins^e supposeth him to have written against many heresies. Who at the same time mentions and commends his noble work against Porphyry. Epiphanius^f mentions Apollinarius together with others who had written against the Manichees. Philostorgius^g says, he wrote against Eunomius. By Theophilus bishop of Alexandria, who flourished about the year 385, he is said to^h have written against the Arians, Eunomians, and other heretics.

III. There are some other works of Apollinarius spoken of by ancient writers, which I may take some notice of by and by. But I would first of all give an account of the wrong opinions, which he is said to have advanced in the latter part of his life: this I could willingly have declined, if it had not been a necessary part of his history. Of these errors, accounts may be seen in manyⁱ ancient, and^k modern writers, to whom I refer; some of which, especially the ancient, I shall quote.

1. Epiphanius, who speaks of Apollinarius with great respect, and says, that he had been long highly esteemed by Athanasius, and all the catholics in general, represents his opinion in this manner: that^l when the Son of God became incarnate, he took a human body, and animal or sensitive soul, but not mind, or an intelligent soul, and thereby denied him to have taken upon him perfect man. The^m doctrine con-

^e Quam multas ille hæreses multis voluminibus oppresserit, quot inimicos fidei confutaverit errores, indicio est opus illud triginta non minus librorum nobilissimum ac maximum, quo insanas Porphyrii calumnias magna probationum mole confudit. V. E. Adv. Hær. cap. 16.

^f Hær. 66. n. xxi. ^g Hist. Ec. l. viii. c. 12. ^h Cessent Apollinaris discipuli ea quæ contra ecclesiasticas regulas est locutus, propter alia ejus scripta defendere. Licet enim adversus Arianos, et Eunomianos scripserit, et Origenem, aliosque hæreticos sua disputatione subverterit. &c. Theoph. lib. Palch. i. ap. Hieron. T. iv. P. ii. p. 694.

ⁱ Athanas. Ep. ad Epistlet. T. i. p. 901. &c. [et ap. Epiphanius. H. 77. n. iii.—xiii. p. 997. &c.] Contr. Apollin. l. i. et ii. p. 921—925. Greg. Naz. Ep. ad Nectar. seu Or. 46. T. i. p. 721. Ep. 1. et 2. ad Cledon. sive Or. 51. et 52. p. 737—749. Greg. Nyss. Antirhet. adv. Apollinar. ap. Zacagn. Monum. Vet. p. 123—287. Basil Ep. 129. al. 59. T. iii. p. 220. Ep. 191. al. 382. p. 223. et alibi.—Epiph. H. 77. Socrat. l. ii. c. 46. Sozom. l. vi. cap. 28. Theodoret.

H. E. l. v. cap. 3, 4. Hær. Fab. l. iv. c. 8. et 9. l. v. cap. xi. Rufin. H. E. l. ii. c. 20. Aug. de Hær. cap. 55. Leon. Byzant. adv. fraudes Apollinistarum. ap. B. P. P. Lugdon. T. ix. p. 707.

^k Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 250. and Lives of the Fathers (in English,) in the Life of Greg. Naz. § v. p. 312. Pearson upon the Creed Art. v. p. 237. &c. Lond. 1676. Mr. Bower's History of the Popes, Vol. i. p. 203—211. S. Basnag. Ann. 364. n. xi. xii. Fr. Spanhem. T. i. p. 890.

^l Εδοξε γὰρ τισὶ παραβαλλεῖν τὸν υἱὸν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἰσχυρῆς παρουσίας, καὶ λεῖπει, ὅτι σὰρκα λαβεῖν ὁ Χριστὸς ἔθελον ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ ψυχὴν, οὐκ ἐχ' ἑλθεῖν, τέλει τελευτῶν ἀνθρώπων. H. 77. n. i. p. 996. Vid. et n. ii. ^m Ἄλλοι δὲ ἔφασκαν τὸν γενοῦσα ἱερηνεῖαι, ὅτι ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἀναστάσει χιλιόεταστῆρα τινα ἐπιλέξαντες, τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐμποδίζοντο, οὗτοι καὶ ἐν, ὡς καὶ ἰομοῖ, καὶ ἄλλα φυλακιστοῖς, καὶ πάντα τῆς χρεώσεως τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, γὰρ τε καὶ περιέμελλε, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μὴ ἐχούσης, οὗτοι δὲ πάντες περὶ αὐτῶν πετιγέσκονται, ὡς δὲ τινες διδάσκουσιν αὐτοῖς, τὴν ἐφ' ἧς αὐτοὶ ἱερηνεῖαι. H. 77. n. xxvi. p. 1031.

cerning the thousand years to be spent on this earth by raised saints and martyrs, appeared to Epiphanius so absurd, that he could not believe it of him, though he had been assured of it by several.

2. Basil speaks, as if Apollinarius had in some of his writings endeavoured ^a to revive the Sabellian doctrine concerning the Deity. In another letter ^b he mentions some obscure expressions concerning the Trinity, which perhaps were not his; and are not, I think, delivered by Basil, as certainly known to be his. His ^c opinion concerning the person of Christ, or his incarnation, Basil says, had occasioned great disturbances. That letter is supposed to have been written in 377, or thereabout. The doctrine of Apollinarius concerning the Millennium, as represented by ^d Basil in the same letter, is a very crude notion; and yet is agreeable to that which Epiphanius had been informed of; and is also much the same with what Jerom not seldom ascribes to ^e our people, meaning catholics. I have put down below several of his passages, to be added to some others, transcribed ^f formerly. Well might Basil and Jerom call it a Jewish doctrine, and they who held it Judaizers; if indeed they expected that good men should be raised up again to spend a thousand years in the land of Judea, and that the law of Moses should again be set up with circumcision, sacrifices at the temple in Jerusalem, and other usages of that institution.

3. Gregory Nazianzen in his letter to Nectarius of Constantinople represents Apollinarius to teach in his writings, that

^a Ουχι οι περι το Θεο λογοι πληρεις παρ' αλλω εισιν ασειν δογματων της παλαιας ασεειας τε μαλαι φρονος Σαβελλιου δι' αυτη αναπαυσις εν τωι συλασμοι. Basil. ep. 263. al. 293. T. iii. p. 409. D.

^b Vid. ep. 129. al. 59. T. iii. p. 220. Conf. ep. 263. p. 409. D. E.

^c Εἴπα και τα περι σαρκωσις τοσαυτην ποιεῖ τη ἀδελφότητι την ταραχην, ὡς εἴη, ὅτι λοιπὸν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν ἀρχαίων της ἐκείνης διαζωσθὲν χαρακτηρῶ. κ. λ. ep. 263. al. 74. p. 407. A.

^d Εἰ δὲ αὐτῶ και το περι αναστασις μεθικας συλασμοι, μαλθα δὲ Ιεδαικας. Εἰς οὗτοι παλιν ημῶς προς την ἐκκλησιαν ἐπεστρεφειν ἡμεῖς, και παλιν ημῶς περι- ἡμεῖς ποιεῖν, και σάββαζον, και βρωματων ἀπαιτεῖν, και θυσιῶν ἀρροσισιν Θεῷ και προσκυνησιν ἐν Ιερουσαλημ, ἐπὶ τῷ ναῷ, και οὕτως ἀπο Χριστιανῶν Ιεδαίως γινώσκων. ep. 263. p. 406. E.

^f Respondeant

amatores tantum occidentis literæ, et in mille annos exquisitos cibos gulæ ac luxuriæ præparantes—qui post secundum in gloria Salvatoris adventum sperant nuptias, et parvulos centum annorum, et circumcisimus injuriam, et victimarum sanguinem, et perpetuum sabbathum. In II. cap. lx. T. iii. P. i. p. 396.

Hæc illi et nostri judaizantes, qui mille annorum regnum in Judæa sibi finibus pollicentur, et auream Jerusalem, et victimarum sanguinem, et filios ac nepotes, et delicias incredibiles. In Joel. cap. iii. T. p. ii. p. 1364. Vid. ibid. p. 1367.

Hæc omnia—Judæi et Judaizantes nostri, immo non nostri, qui Judaizantes, sperant futura corporaliter: utique et circumcisionem sibi, et conjugia in mille annorum imperio promittentes. In Zach. xiv. T. iii. p. 1803.

^e See Vol. iii. p. 114, 115.

Christ

Christ¹ brought his body from heaven: this he argued from John iii. 13. 1 Cor. xv. 47. Next, that this man from heaven was not endowed with mind, but that the only begotten of the Father supplied the place of mind, being joined to an animal sensitive soul, and a body: and that he likewise taught, that God the Word, or the only begotten, suffered in his Deity. In another place² Gregory takes notice of Apollinarius's notion concerning the Millennium: but undoubtedly, the particulars just mentioned were the most offensive. However, Gregory does also charge him with teaching, that³ there are degrees in the Trinity.

4. Theodoret, in his Heretical Fables, says, that⁴ in some of his writings Apollinarius made no innovations in the doctrine of the Trinity, but appeared to agree with us, teaching one substance of the Deity, and three persons. But in some of his writings he speaks of degrees in the Trinity, saying, that the Spirit is great, the Son greater, the Father greatest of all. In other writings, he confounds the properties of the Divine Persons, and for that reason has been charged with Sabellianism. Moreover, he says, that when God the Word took flesh, he took a body and soul, not a rational, but an irrational soul, which some call sensitive and animal: and the Divine nature supplied the place of a soul. In another place Theodoret expresseth himself after this manner: Arius⁵ and Eunomius said, that Christ had an human body, and that the Divinity was in the place of a soul. Apollinarius said, that Christ had an animated [or living] body, but not a reasonable soul: for the mind was superfluous, where God the Word was present. Again in his Ecclesiastical History also, Theodoret speaks distinctly of Apollinarius's several opinions, and there slightly mentions also⁶ his opinion concerning the divine promises, or the retributions to be hereafter given to good men.

¹ Ad Nestar. Or. 46. p. 722.

² Ad Cleod. ep. 2. al. Or. 52. p. 717. C.

³ Ad Cleod. ep. 1. l. v. c. 8. p. 240.

⁴ Or. 51. p. 744. C. D.

⁵ Αλλ' ὁμοίως κινῶν καὶ τὴν μίαν τῆς θεότητος οὐσίαν, καὶ τὰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ἐκείνην· ἢ ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ βαθμῇ ἀξιωματικῶν ὡρίων, ἐκείνου διατομῆς τῆς θεϊκῆς χειροποίητος ἡμῶν. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν πνεῦμα, τὸ μέγα, μέγιστον. — Ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς παλαιοῖς συγγραμμάσι τὰς τῶν ὑποστάσεων συνῆχον ἰδιότηας. — Οὐδὲν καὶ τὴν τῆς Σαβελιανισμοῦ καθήγοριαν ἐδείξατο. Σαρκωθεῖναι τὴν θεοῦ ἐφ' ἣν λόγον, σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν αἰετῶν.

ληφθῆναι, ἢ τῆς λογικῆς, ἀλλὰ τῆς αἰσθητῆς, ἢ φυσικῆς ἢ ζωικῆς τινος νομαζέσθαι. H. F. l. iv. c. 8. p. 240.

⁶ Ἀρριος δὲ καὶ εὐνομίος σῶμα μὲν αὐτὸν εἰληφέναι, τὴν θεοῦ οὐσίαν δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐντρίχκεναι τὴν χρειαίαν· ὁ δὲ Ἀπολλινάριος ἐμψυχὸν μὲν εἶπεν εἶναι τὸ σῶμα, ἢ μὴ τῆς λογικῆς ἐσχῆναι καὶ ψυχὴν· περὶ τοῦ γὰρ πν. φησὶ, ὁ πν. τῆς θεοῦ λόγῳ παρούς. Hæc. Fab. l. v. c. 11. p. 278. Conf. ad Flavian. ep. 104. T. iii. p. 975. D.

⁷ Καὶ ἄλλως τὰς θεαῖς ἀπαγγελίαις συνῆχον καὶ ἄλλως τὰς θεαῖς ἀπαγγελίαις συνῆχον. H. E. l. v. c. 3. p. 200. D.

5. Jerom sometimes speaks of Apollinarius's opinions concerning the incarnation, or ^b his defective notion of the person of Christ, not allowing him to be perfect man; and ^c the Millennarian doctrine. He also speaks of an opinion of his ^d concerning the soul: which, however, was not reckoned a part of his heresy.

6. I put below what ^e Rufinus, and ^f Vincent of Lerins say of Apollinarius's doctrine concerning the incarnation.

7. I transcribe below ^g at length Augustine's article of the Apollinarists. He speaks of them in several other places; from one of which we perceive, that ^h they argued in favour of their doctrine concerning the incarnation from John i. 14. I transcribe in the margin ⁱ a passage or two more, to be observed by my readers at leisure. And I refer also to ^k other places of Augustine, where he treats somewhat largely of the opinions of these people.

^b — dimidiatam Christi introduxit œconomiam. Ad Pamm. ep. 41. al. 65. T. iv. p. 342.

^c Hic [Papias] dicitur, mille annorum Judaicam edidisse *δουλειαν*, quem secuti sunt Irenæus, et Apollinarius, et ceteri, qui post resurrectionem aiunt in carne cum sanctis Dominum regnatum. De Papias. cap. 18. V. I. Vid. et Proem. in II. Comm. l. xviii. T. 3. p. 478. et in Ezech. c. 36. p. 952. m.

^d — an certe ex traduce: ut Tertulianus, Apollinarius, et maxima pars Occidentalium. Ad Marcell. et Anaps. ep. 78. al. 82. T. iv. p. 642.

^e — asserens solum corpus, non etiam animam a Domino in dispensatione susceptam—Post—ait, eum quidem habuisse animam, sed non ex ea quæ rationabilis est, sed ex ea solum quæ vivificabat corpus: ad supplementum vero rationabilis partis, ipsum Verbum Dei fuisse perhibebat. Ruf. H. E. l. ii. c. 20.

^f Apollinaris vero in unitatem quidem Trinitatis quasi consentire se jactat, et hoc ipsum plena fidei sanctitate. Sed in Domini incarnatione aperta professione blasphematur. Dicit enim, in ipsa Salvatoris nostri carne aut animam humanam penitus non fuisse, aut certe talem fuisse, cui mens et ratio non esset. Sed et ipsam Domini carnem non de sanctæ virgini, Mariæ carne susceptam, sed de cœlo in virginem descendisse dicebat: eamque nutabundus semper et dubius modo coæternam Deo Verbo, modo de Verbi Divinitate factam predicabat. Vincent. Lirin. Comm. cap. 17.

^g Apollinaristas Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima Christi a Catholicis dissenserunt, dicentes,

sicut Ariani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In qua quæstione testimoniis evangelicis victi, mentem, quæ rationalis est anima hominis defuisse anime Christi, sed pro hac ipsum Verbum in eo fuisse dixerunt. De ipsa vero ejus carne sic a recta fide dissensisse prohibentur, ut dicerent, carnem illam et Verbum unum ejusdemque substantiæ: contentiosissime asseverantes, Verbum carnem factum, hoc est, Verbi aliquid in carnem fuisse conversum atque mutatum, non autem carnem de Mariæ carne fuisse susceptam. De Hier. cap. 55. T. viii.

^h — quoniam modum argumentantur Apollinaristæ, ut quicumque sunt alii, adversus animam Domini: quam propterea negant, quis scriptum legunt, *Verbum caro factum est*. Si enim et anima, inquit, ibi est, debet dici: Verbum homo factum est. De Anima et ejus Origine. l. i. c. 18. p. 31. T. i.

ⁱ Nec ita hominem, [dicimus Christum] ut aliquid minus habeat quod ad humanum certum est pertinere naturam, sive animam, sive in ipsa anima mentem rationalem, sive carnem, non de femina sumtam, sed factam de Verbo in carnem converso atque mutato. Quæ omnia tria falsa et vana, hæreticorum Apollinaristarum tres partes varias diversasque fecerunt. De Dono Perseverantiæ. cap. 24. T. 8. P. i.

Fuerunt enim quidam hæretici, et pulsi sunt ab Ecclesia, qui putarent, non habere mentem rationalem corpus Christi, sed quasi animam belluinam. In Joan. Evang. Tr. 23. n. 6. T. iii. Pf. 2. Vid. ib. Tr. 47. n. 9. ^k Vid. Enarr. in Pf. 29. n. 2. in Pf. 83. n. 4. T. iv.

8. Socrates intirely agrees with Rufinus, whom probably he copied, in the account of their doctrine concerning the incarnation: but he adds, the ¹ Apollinarians said; in this only did they differ from the catholics, for they believed a consubstantial Trinity. Vincent also, transcribed not long ago, has somewhat to the like purpose. And it must be owned to be in favour of Apollinarius in this respect, that ^a Philostorgius, a learned Arian, reckons Apollinarius, together with Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, one of the best defenders of the homouſian doctrine. And that he and his followers still professed to retain the Nicene faith, may be inferred from ^a Athanasius's arguments with them. And Leontius of Byzantium, who was no friend to Apollinarius, allows ^o him to be orthodox upon the Trinity; and imputes to him only an erroneous doctrine concerning the incarnation: for though Gregory and some others charge him with advancing degrees in the Trinity, he did not use the word *created* of the Son or the Spirit. Concerning this point, may be seen a note of the Benedictine editors ^p of St. Ambrose's works.

9. S. Bafnage ^q allows the truth of what is generally said of Apollinarius, that he supposed the Word to supply in the man Jesus the place of a rational soul: and as what he says may illustrate the point, I have transcribed him somewhat largely in the margin. But he thinks, that the opinions ascribed to Apollinarius by Gregory Nazianzen, in the letter to Nectarius before quoted, written about the year 385, not to have been held by him; as that our Saviour brought his body from hea-

¹ Περὶ τούτων μοι δὲ λέγουσι διαφερισθαι, αἱ μὲν ἐξ ἐκείνων τὴν προσωποποιήσαντες τὴν γὰρ τριάδα ομοουσίαν εἶναι φασί. Socr. l. ii. c. 46. p. 161. B.

^a Vid. Suid. V. Ἀπολλινάριος.

^o Ep. ad Epictet. p. 903. E. p. 904. A. B. et alibi.

^p Ο δὲ Ἀπολλινάριος περὶ μὴ τὴν θεολογίαν ἢ φανίλας ἀμαρτανίας, πλὴν διελίχου καὶ τούτων οἱ Γρηγοριοὶ περὶ ταύτης ἀμαρτανίας· Κλισμα μὲν γὰρ φασί, ἢ λέγουσιν ὑποτάσσιν δὲ μικρὰν λέγουσιν τὴν γὰρ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, πρὸς τοῦ Πατέρα· Περὶ δὲ τὴν οἰκονομίαν φανερὸς διβαλλίλο. Εἰς γὰρ τὸ σῶμα, οἱ ἐνδυσάλο οἱ θεοὶ λέγουσιν, ψυχὴν μὲν εἶναι, νῦν δὲ ὑδάμωσ· ἀλλ' ὡς πρὸς ἀλλοτρίαν ψυχὴν, ὡς ἐλέγειν εἶναι. De Sectis. Act. iv. Ap. B. P. P. Morell. T. xi. p. 507. et Latine ap. B. P. P. Lugd. T. ix. p. 666.

^q Ad Ambr. de Incarnat. Domini Sacram. c. 2. T. ii. p. 705.

^r Id etiam luculentissime demonstrat ipse Apollinarius, epistola Episcopis Dioeceseos

scripta, quam ob oblivione Leontius vindicavit. Confitemur, non ad hominem sanctum venisse Verbum Dei, quod erat in Prophetis, sed ipsum Verbum carnem factum esse, non assumpta mente humana, mente mutabili, quæ turpibus cogitationibus captiva ducitur, sed divina mente immutabili et cælesti. Leont. adv. Fraudes Apollinarist. ap. Bib. P. P. Lugdun. T. ix. p. 712. Mentem itaque, non animam, a Christo abjudicabat.—Ex fontibus porro Platonis videtur errorem deduxisse suum. Quod et asserit Nemefius de Nat. Hom. cap. i. Quidam, e quibus est Plotinus, aliud esse animam, et aliud mentem statuentes, ex tribus constare volunt hominem, e corpore, anima, et mente. Hos secutus est Apollinarius Laodiceæ Episcopus. His enim jactis fundamentis sententiæ suæ, reliqua dogmati suo consentanea superstruxit, S. Bafn. Ann. 364. n. xii. p. 6.

ven, and that his Divinity suffered. Though Gregory quotes, as a voucher, a work of Apollinarius himself; he says, it could not be his, but rather a work of one of his disciples. He moreover argues, that Theodoret in his *Heretical Fables* does not ascribe the opinion of the descent of Christ's body from heaven to Apollinarius, but to some of his followers.

10. To which I would answer, that there appears not any good reason to deny the genuineness of the book alleged by Gregory Nazianzen. To do so is an arbitrary proceeding: for what account can be given of Gregory's mistaking the author? Secondly, Theodoret in his work of *Heretical Fables* does, indeed, make two chapters, one of Apollinarius, another of the Polemians and others his disciples. And in this last chapter he says, that * some of these were of opinion, that the Lord's body came down from heaven. Nevertheless, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, Theodoret speaking of Apollinarius says: Sometimes † he said, that our Lord took flesh, or his body, of the holy virgin: at other times, that his flesh came down from heaven, together with God the Word. Sometimes he said, that the Word was made flesh, without taking any thing from us. Which diversity of sentiments is hinted also in the just cited chapter of the *Heretical Fables*. Yea he there expressly says, that † those of his followers, who said, that the Lord's body came down from heaven, supported themselves by his writings. Thirdly, all the sentiments ascribed to Apollinarius by Gregory, in his letter to Nectarius, appear in other authors of the same time, who wrote against him. That * the body of Christ came down from heaven; that † his flesh and Divinity were homouſian; that ‡ his Deity suffered; are all opinions of Apollinarius, or his disciples, taken notice of by Athanasius in his books against the Apollinarists in 372, or thereabout. The same things are observable in the letter of Athanasius to Epictetus bishop of Corinth, written about the year 371, particularly those offensive notions, that the

* Librum tamen Apollinaristæ potius, quam Apollinaris ipsius esse existimamus. — Librum ea impia continentem subditum esse existimamus. Ib. p. 7. a.

† Και άλλοι δὲ τινες ἐκ τῆς Ἀπολλινάριου συστάσεως, ἐκ τοῦ ἑρᾶντος ἔφασαν κατέλθοντα τὸ κυρίου σῶμα. Διαφορὰ δὲ εὐροῖες ἐν τοῖς ἐκείνῳ συγγράμμασι δογματά, οἱ μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς, οἱ δὲ ἐκείνους ἡρᾶντος. H. F. l. iv. cap. 9.

‡ Ποῦ μὲν γὰρ συνώμολοι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκ τῆς αἰῆς παρθεῖν προσέειπεν.

θεῖναι τὴν σάρκα* αὐτὸς δὲ ἡρᾶντος τῶν τῶ Θεῷ Λόγῳ συγκατέλθοντα φῶν' αὐτὸς ἡλθε δὲ αὐτὸν ἡρᾶντος σαρκὸς αὐτὸς ἐκ ἡμῶν ἐκλήφθη. H. E. l. v. c. 3. p. 200. D.

u See note *.

x Πῶς ὑμεῖς παλὶ λέγετε ἐξ ἡρᾶντος τὸ σῶμα; Athanas. contr. Apollinarist. l. i. n. 7. T. i. p. 927. B.

y Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ὁμοῦσι τὴν σάρκα τῆς θεότητος λέγειν ἐπιχειροῦσι. Ib. p. 929. B. Vid. et E.

z Μαλακοὶ ἂν οἱ τῇ δι' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν παρθεῖν προσέειπεν. — l. ii. p. 955. C.

body

body of Jesus was ^a consubstantial and ^b coëternal with his Deity. The like things are taken notice of by Epiphanius ^c in his article concerning them, written in 377. As Apollinarius was then living, it seems to me to make little difference, whether they were his notions, or his disciples. I might refer likewise to Gregory Nyssen's long work against them published by Zacagni, where all the same sentiments are disputed: as ^d the mortality of the Deity in Christ, the ^e pre-existence of his body, and ^f its being brought down from heaven, as well ^g as the Word's supplying the place of a rational soul in Christ. And Gregory Nyssen supposeth all along, that he argued with Apollinarius himself, as he had expressed his notions in his own work. Indeed some of these things are very strange; which may make us doubt, whether Apollinarius be not misrepresented, and whether some of the opinions ascribed to him are not consequences which he did not own: but I apprehend, that they are as much his, as his disciples.

11. The principal doctrine, by which Apollinarius and his followers were distinguished, was, that Christ had no rational soul, and that the Word supplied the office of it. With respect to that opinion, Epiphanius ^h gave them the denomination of Dimœritæ, and so intitled his article concerning them: denoting persons, who maimed the person of Christ, and made him consist of two parts only, animated flesh, and Divinity: whereas the catholics supposed him to have an human soul, or mind, and a human body, with the Word.

IV. I now proceed to observe some of his works, which have not yet been taken notice of.

^a Πως αὐτὸς κρυφαῖο, ὁμοῦσιον εἶπεν τὴν μαρτίαν σώματος τῆς τοῦ λόγου θεότητος; Ad Epist. p. 902. B.

Πότεν ὅμως ἐπὶ τὴν εἰρημὴν εἶπεν, ὡς εἶποι, ὁμοῦσιον εἶναι τὸ σῶμα τῆς τοῦ λόγου θεότητος; Αὐτοὶ γὰρ τοῦτο καλὸν εἶναι ἀρξασθαι. Ib. p. 903. E.

^b — ὡς εἶπεν μὴ νωτὸν εἶναι τὸ σῶμα τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λογῆς θεότητος, ἀλλὰ συναϊναι αὐτῷ διαπαρίσσει γινώσκονται, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ τῆς ἰσότητος τῆς σοφίας συνέστη. p. 902. D.

^c Vid. H. 77. n. ii. p. 997, 998.

^d Ἀπὸ γὰρ αὐτῶν τῆς λογιζομένης οὐκ ἐκείνῳ πρὸς τὸ τοῦτο βλεπόμεν, τὸ θεῶν τῶν θεότητων. Gr. Nyss. adv. Apoll. ap. Zacagn. Monum. Vet. p. 132. in.

^e Εἰ γὰρ αὐτὴ τεθῆκεν τῇ μονοθεῶς θεοῦ, συναντῶνται ταῦτα παρὸς καὶ τὴν ζωὴν. Ibid. infr. Vid. et p. 133, 134.

^f Ib. p. 150, 151. et alibi.

^g Ib. p. 205.

et alibi.

^h Ib. p. 220. &c.

^h Dimœritarum porro nomine Apollinaristas infestatur Epiphanius Hær. 77. Cujus appellationis causam aperit Gregorius Nazianz. cum ait Orat. 46. p. 722. corpus et animam esse in Christo το τρίτη μορφή, tertiam partem. Apollinaristas quippe aiebant, in Christo partem unam hominis, ἡν scilicet, seu mentem, a Verbo suppleri, solumque Verbum junctum corpori et animæ, [nempe sensitivæ ut discitabant illi] totum constituere Christum. Quamobrem, cum ex Catholicorum sententia tribus constaret Christus, Verbo scilicet, mente humana, et corpore animato, qui unam ex illis demerent partem, mentem scilicet, a duabus aliis διμοιρίσαι audiebant. Nam διμοιρίσαι Græcis est dux tertiarum partes. &c. Benedictin. in ep. ad Epictet. Admon. ap. Athan. p. 900.

1. Basil, in a letter written in 376, mentions ¹ a book concerning the Holy Spirit, which he had not seen. Whether this book regarded any of his peculiar notions, I cannot certainly say. Here Basil says, he had heard, that Apollinarius was become the most voluminous of writers: but he had seen few of his works. In another letter, written in 377, he says, that ² Apollinarius, being endowed with a great facility of writing, had filled the whole world with his books, neglecting the advice of Solomon in Ecc. xii. 12.

2. When Basil ¹ gives an account of Apollinarius's doctrine concerning the incarnation, he may be supposed to refer to some writing of his. When Gregory Nazianzen speaks of the same matter, he appears ² to have had a volume of Apollinarius before him, though he does not mention the title. Gregory Nyssen ³ expressly names the book confuted by him.

3. When Basil gives an account of Apollinarius's notion concerning the Millennium, he seems also to refer ⁴ to some book: whether he means the work against Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, mentioned by ⁵ Jerom, I cannot say.

4. Apollinarius wrote verse easily, and agreeably: and accordingly composed short psalms and hymns, fitted for festivals, and for all seasons, and upon a great variety of subjects, all tending to the praise and glory of God. The men sung them at their work, and at their entertainments; the women sung them at the spindle: and some were sung by his followers in their religious assemblies, in the room of those which were generally used. So says Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History. Gregory Nazianzen, referring to these poems, speaks, as if they had a new Psalter, but dissonant from that of David; and

¹ Οὐ μὴν περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τῆς αἰνῆς ἡ αἰνῆσας αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ βιβλίον, ἡ ἀποσταλὲς ὑποδείξαί μοι. Ἀλλὰ πολυφώνησιν μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀκὼν παλίων συγγραφεὶν γινέσθαι. κ. λ. Ep. 244. al. 82. T. iii. p. 378.

² Ep. 263. al. 74. p. 404. ¹ Ep. 263. p. 407. A. Vid. supra p. 388. note P.

³ — ὅτι μοι περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν χερσὶ τῆς Ἀπολλινάριου, ἐν ᾧ τὰ καλίστιστα δοκίμα πᾶσαν αἰρέσιν κακίαν περιέρχεται. Or. 46. p. 722. A.

⁴ Ὡς δ' ἂν μὴ δοκίμη λαοδωρία τοῦ λεγόμενου εἶναι, ἐὰν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ περιφερομένων λόγων προσήσωμαι, ὃ ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ ἐστὶν αὐτῇ· Ἀποδείξεις, Φῆσι, περὶ τῆς θείας σαρκώσεως τῆς καθ' ὁμοιωσιν ἀνθρώπου. Gr. Nyss. Antirrh. adv. Apol. ap. Zacagn. p. 125, 126.

⁵ Ep. 263. p. 406. Vid. supra p. 388. not. 9.

⁶ P Cui duobus voluminibus respondit A-

pollinarius, quem non solum suæ sectæ homines, sed et nostrorum in hac parte doctrinæ plurima sequitur multitudo. Comm. in. II. T. iii. p. 478. M.

⁷ — παρὰ τὰς νενομισμένας ἡμετέρας, ἐμμίρα τινα μελῶδη ψαλλόντες παρ' αὐτοῦ Ἀπολλινάριου εὐρημένα. — Ἀντίρρησις παρὰ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐν ἱερῶν, καὶ γυναικῶν παρὰ τῆς ἡμέρας τὰ αὐτῶν μελῶδη λόγῳ. Σπυρίδης γὰρ καὶ ἀντιστοχὴ καὶ ἰεροὶ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, πρὸς τὸν ἐκαστὸν καὶ ἑκάστην αὐτῶν σπουδῇ, πάντα οἷς ἐκλήσκει ὁ θεὸς τειροῖται. Soz. I. vi. c. 25. p. 671. B. C.

⁸ Εἰ δὲ οἱ μακροὶ λόγοι, καὶ ἡ ψαλμῶν χάρις, ἡ τῆς διαθήκης νομιμία καὶ ἡμεῖς ψαλμοποιήσομεν, καὶ πάντα γράσομεν, καὶ μίλησομεν. Greg. Naz. ad Cledon. ep. 1. p. 745. B. C.

as if his writings were made by his followers a third Testament, or a part of sacred scripture: in which he may be supposed to aggravate more than a little.

5. There is a collection of small poems*, fifty-three in number, called *Homerici Centones de Christo*. The subjects are taken out of the Old and New Testament, chiefly the latter: They are such as these, our Saviour's conception and birth, the presents brought by the Magi, the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, John the Baptist, the wedding at Cana, the woman of Samaria, the raising of Lazarus from the dead, and several other of our Saviour's miracles, our Lord's crucifixion, burial, resurrection, and ascension. But these are not generally ascribed to Apollinarius.

6. I hope, I have now given a sufficient account of the works and opinions of Apollinarius; not thinking it needful to enter farther into the history of his followers, or the sentences of condemnation pronounced by councils upon him, or them. They who desire a more particular account of those things may consult the writings of the learned moderns formerly referred to.

V. It is almost needless to observe, that Apollinarius received all the scriptures of the Old and New Testament which we do, without adding to them any other, so far as we know. His firm belief of the Christian religion, appears in the books written in the defence of it, and in the various compositions designed for the benefit of Christians in the troublesome time of Julian's reign. His respect for the scriptures is manifest to all, from his numerous commentaries upon them, which have been particularly taken notice of in this chapter.

VI. I never intended to draw the character of Apollinarius. Shall I, nevertheless, present the reader with that given by Tillemont? but without adopting it. 'He seems,' says[†] that laborious writer, 'to have preserved always the outside of a holy and exemplary life; of which nevertheless Gregory of Nyssa seems not to have been fully persuaded. But he also maintained to the end his impiety, and died in his heresy. So[‡] that we cannot admit the hope of any other lot for him, but the condemnation of hell. Such has been the unhappy condition of this great man, who had received so extraordinary talents of nature, and so great gifts of grace, who had

* Ap. Bib. PP. Morell. T. xiv. p. 95 Les Apollinaristes, Art. 13. Mem. T. vii.
[†] See p. 387. note k. * De sorte qu' on ne peut esperer d' autre
[‡] Il semble avoir toujours conservé l' ex- fort pour luy que la condamnation d' enfer.
 terieur d' une vie sainte et exemplaire. Ibid.

‘ combated with so much courage, and so much glory, for
 ‘ the true faith against the enemies of it. But because he
 ‘ trusted in his own wisdom, because he would solve those dif-
 ‘ ficulties, which human reason cannot clear up, because he
 ‘ gave way to the desires of a vain curiosity; all the advantages
 ‘ which he had, became unprofitable to him, and he has de-
 ‘ served to be regarded by all the church, as a schismatic and
 ‘ a heretic.’

It must be owned, that the notions advanced by him in the latter part of his life have greatly diminished his credit: but yet, I would hope, they need not be understood to have obliterated the merit of his past services for the Christian religion. And I believe, that all my readers in general may concur in a wish, that we still had his confutation of Porphyry, which has been highly commended by learned Christians of different sentiments in former times.

Du Pin^y having mentioned Apollinarius’s Paraphrase of the Psalms, adds: ‘ All the other works of this author are lost, except some fragments. His error, in all probability, occasioned this loss: the catholics had such a dread of the books of heretics, that they have not preserved so much as those which had no relation to their heresy, and which might have been useful to the church: for which reason we have scarce any books of heretics left. And the Eutychians were obliged to put out the works of Apollinarius with the names of catholic authors.”

If that be so, we must acknowledge, that the catholics were to blame; it is like rooting up tares and good corn all together. And we may hence receive this instruction; to be upon our guard, that we admit not too great an aversion for men on account of difference of sentiment, in things of a speculative nature; lest by violence in opposing error, we should obstruct the progress of knowledge, and the cause of truth, which we are desirous to serve.

I have written the name of this author Apollinarius. I shall here transcribe a note of ^z Du Pin, as it may serve for my justification with those, who are but little acquainted with such things. ‘ The ^z Greeks,’ says he, always call him *Απολλινάριος*. ‘ St. Basil alone writes his name with two *αλ*. II. St. Jerom calls him Apollinarius. The generality of the Latin writers give him the name of Apollinaris, as more soft.’ I have

^y Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 127.

^z Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 127. not ^z.

chosen to follow the Greeks, and Jerom, in the termination of his name: unless I might have dropped the harsh ending, and written his name Apollinaire, as the French do. I shall only add, that in L. Kuster's edition of Suidas, a Greek author, the name is written with a double l. His name is written in the like manner, in ²² the Paschal Chronicle.

C H A P. XCVI.

DAMASUS, BISHOP OF ROME.

1. DAMASUS, though not without a warm contest with Ursinus, or Ursicinus, his competitor, succeeded Liberius, bishop of Rome, who died in September 366. The disturbances in the city, occasioned by that competition, are taken notice of by Jerom in his ^a Chronicle, and by Ammianus Marcellinus ^b a heathen author, as well as by ^c our Ecclesiastical Historians. Socrates says, 'there ^d was at that time a great disturbance among the citizens of Rome. Nor was it owing to a contention about any doctrine of the faith, or about any heresy, but only who should have the episcopal chair.' Damasus sat in that see above eighteen years, and died in 384, being then almost eighty years of age.

2. Damasus is in Jerom's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers: and I transcribe the article ^e below. What he says of him is chiefly this: That he had a good talent for poetry, and wrote several small pieces in verse. In another place he says, that ^f

²² p. 237. C. Paris. 1688.

^a Romanæ Ecclesiæ tricesimus quintus ordinatur Episcopus Damasus. Et non post multum temporis intervallum Ursinus a quibusdam Episcopus constitutus Sicinini cum suis invadit. Quo Damasianæ partis populo confluyente, crudelissima interfectiones diversi sexus perpetræ. Chr. p. 186.

^b Damasus et Ursinus supra humanum modum ad rapiendam episcopatus sedem ardentes scissis studiis alperrime confluebantur, ad usque mortis vulnerumque discrimina adjumentis utriusque progressi.—Et in concertatione superaverat Damasus, parte quæ ei favebat instante. Constatque, in basilica Sicinini, ubi ritus Christiani est conventiculum, uno die centum triginta septem reperta cadavera pe-

remptorum: effertamque plebem ægre postea delentam. Ammian. l. xxvii. c. 3.

^c Vid. Socr. l. iv. c. 29. Soz. l. vi. c. 23. Ruf. l. ii. c. 10. Faustin. et Marcellin. Lib. Pr. in Præf. ap. Bib. PP. T. V. p. 652.

^d Ερασιαζον εν προς αυτους, η δια τινα. περι η αιρεσιν, αλλα περι του μοτου τις οφειλει τη επισκοπικη θρονω εκρατης γενεσθαι. l. iv. c. 29.

^e Damasus Romanæ Urbis Episcopus elegans in versibus componendis ingenium habuit, multaque et brevia metro edidit, et prope octogenarius sub Theodosio Principe mortuus est. De V. I. cap. 103.

^f Legas—beati Cypriani volumen egregium, et Papæ Damasi super hac re, versu prosaque composita. Ad Eustochium. ep. 18. al. 22. T. iv. p. 37. m.

Damasus had written in praise of virginity, both in prose and verse. There² are still extant several small poems, which are ascribed to him, but not allowed by all to be genuine, which have been published, together with his epistles, and a history of his life, and numerous testimonies to him, collected out of ancient and later writers.

3. Damasus had a great regard for Jerom, on account of his learning and knowledge of the scriptures. Jerom³ whilst in the East wrote to Damasus, asking his advice concerning his own conduct. When⁴ Jerom came to Rome in 382, Damasus employed him as his secretary, to write letters for him upon ecclesiastical affairs, in answer to councils or bishops in foreign parts. Here⁵ Jerom stayed three years, that is, till some time after the death of Damasus, and returned into the East in 385.

4. At the desire of Damasus, Jerom¹ corrected the edition of the Latin version of the New Testament, or of the gospels at least. At his request it is also said^m that Jerom revised the Latin version of the Psalms, which had been made from the Greek of the Seventy: and it is certain, thatⁿ this was done by him when at Rome. Damasus^o put Jerom upon translating Dydimus's Treatise upon the Spirit out of Greek into Latin: but it was not finished until after his death.

5. Damasus often wrote to Jerom letters containing questions concerning difficult texts of scripture. To him is addressed^p Jerom's explication of the vision of the Seraphim in the sixth chapter of Isaiah. In a letter^q still extant, Damasus desires

² S. Damasi Papæ Opera quæ exstant, et Vita ex Cod. mss. cum notis M. S. Sarazani. Romæ 1638. Paris. 1672. et ap. Bib. P. P. Max. T. xxvii. p. 55—97. Vid. et Baron. Ann. 384. n. xxxxi. &c.

³ Vid. Hieron. ep. 14. al. 17. T. iv. P. 2. p. 19. ep. 16. al. 58. p. 22.

⁴ Ante annos plurimos, quum in chartis ecclesiasticis juvarem Damasum Romanæ Urbis Episcopum, et Orientis atque Occidentis synodicis consultationibus responderem. Ad Agerach. ep. 91. T. iv. p. 744. f.

⁵ Pene certe triennium cum eis vixi. Ad Afell. ep. 28. al. 94. T. iv. p. 66. in.

¹ Vid. Hieron. ep. 142. seu Præf. in. iv. Evangelia. T. i. p. 1426. edit. Bened.

^m Vid. Baron. Ann. 382. n. 27. et Tillem. S. Damase. art. 18. Mem. T. 8.

ⁿ Psalterium Romæ dudum positus emendatum, et juxta Septuaginta Interpretes, licet cursim, magna illud ex parte correx-

ram. Pr. in libr. Psalm. T. i. p. 1222.

Psalterium quoque, quod certe emendatissimum juxta septuaginta Interpretes nollis labore dudum Roma suscepit, rursus juxta Hebraicum vertens, præfatione muniri. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. T. 4. p. 429.

^o Cum in Babylone versarer, et perperatæ meretricis essem colonus, et jure Quiritum viverem, volui garrere aliquod de Spiritu Sancto, et ceptum opusculum ejusdem Urbis Pontifici dedicare.—Itaque, mi Pauliniane frater, quia supradictus Prefatus Damasus, qui me ad hoc opus primum impulerat, jam dormit in Christo.—Pr. in libr. Didym. de Sp. S. T. iv. P. i. p. 494.

^p Ep. 142. T. iii. p. 515. ed. Bened.
^q Commentaria quum legerem Græco Latinoque sermone in Evangeliorum interpretatione a nostris, id est, orthodoxis viris, olim ac nuper scripta de eo quod legatur

Jerom to give him a clear explication of the word *Hosanna* found in the New Testament, he having met with very different interpretations of it in the Greek and Latin Commentaries of catholic writers, which he had read. This occasioned Jerom to write a letter^r upon that subject, which we still have. At his request likewise Jerom explained the parable of the Prodigal Son. I shall transcribe below^s a part of Damasus's letter, which is inserted in Jerom's answer: whereby it appears, that there were then two common interpretations of that parable: some by the elder and younger sons understanding the Jewish people and the Gentiles, others righteous men and sinners.

6. These^t three epistles or discourses upon the Seraphim, *Hosanna*, and the Prodigal Son, are mentioned by Jerom in the last chapter of his Catalogue, where he enumerates his own works. To his discourse upon the Hebrew word *Hosanna*, he refers likewise in^u his Commentary upon St. Matthew, and to that upon the Seraphim in^w a letter, written about the year 398 or 399.

7. There is also still extant another letter of Damasus, written in the last year of his life: in which he says, there^x could be no higher entertainment, than to confer together upon the holy scriptures: and he desires, that he may propound questions, whilst Jerom makes answers. Here he proposes several difficult texts to Jerom, which^y he afterwards explained. In the same letter Damasus passeth that judgment upon Lactantius, which was formerly^z taken notice of.

*O*sanna Filio David [Matt. xxi. 9.], non solum diversa, sed etiam contraria sibi proferunt. Dilectionis tuæ est, ut ardenti et illo strenuitatis ingenio — quid se habeant apud Hebræos vivo sensu scribas. Ep. 144. ap. Hieron. T. iv. P. i. p. 145.

^r Ep. 145. ib. p. 145. &c.
^s Ais: 'Quis est iste in Evangelio Pater, qui duobus filiis substantiam dividit? Qui duo filii? Qui major, quive minor? — Addis insuper: Scio multos in hac lectione diversa dixisse: et fratrem majorem Judæum, minorem existimasse Gentilem populum. Sed quæro, quomodo Judaico populo possit aptari: Ecce tot annis servi tui, et nunquam mandatum tuum præterii. — Si autem, ut ais, de justo et peccatore voluerimus esse parabolam, justo non potuit convenire, ut de salute alterius, et maxime fratris, contristeretur.'

Ad Damas. ep. 146. Vid. T. iv. P. i. p. 149.

^t De Seraphim, et *O*sanna, et de frugibus et luxurioso filiis. De V. l. cap. ult.

^u In Matth. T. iv. P. i. p. 95, 96.

^w In lectione Isaïæ, in qua duo Seraphim clamantia describuntur. — Habetur liber in manibus, ante viginti annos editus. Ad Pamm. et Ocean. ep. 41. al. 65. T. iv. P. ii. p. 243. in.

^x Neque vero ullam puto digniorem disputationis nostræ confabulationem fore, quam si de Scripturis fermocinemur inter nos: id est, ut ego interrogem, tu respondeas. Qua vita nihil puto in hac luce jucundius, quo animæ pabulo mella omnia superantur. &c. Ep. 124. Vid. T. ii. p. 361

^y Ep. 125. p. 262. &c. ib.

^z See Vol. iv. p. 30, 32.

8. Finally,

8. Finally, Jerom * calls Damafus a great man, and says, he was well acquainted with the scriptures.

9. For a fuller history of Damafus, and his works, I refer to ^b several.

C H A P. XCVII.

BASIL, BISHOP OF CÆSAREA IN CAPPADOCIA.

I. *His time, and works.* II. *Books of scripture received by him.* III. *A passage relating to the epistle to the Ephesians considered.* IV. *Respect for the scriptures.*

I. As St. Basil is in Jerom's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, and the chapter is not long, I place it entire at the bottom of the * page.

It is generally supposed, that Basil, commonly called the great, was born in Cappadocia in the year 328 or 329. And according to ^b the different apprehensions of learned men, he was ordained bishop of Cæsarea, the capital city of his native country in 369, or 370, or 371, and died in the very beginning of 378, or 379, or 380, having been bishop eight years, and somewhat more.

Many writings have been ascribed to Basil without ground. For which reasons divers learned moderns ^c have taken commendable pains in distinguishing the spurious from the genuine. In which service none, I think, have excelled Julian Garner, the Benedictine editor of St. Basil's works. I wish, however, that he had been able to reduce his observations into less compass.

II. I know of no reason to doubt, that Basil received all the books of the New Testament that we do; but I cannot say, that he has quoted them all. He has quoted all St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews, as his. He does not much quote the catholic epistles: however, he has several

* Dum adhuc viveret sanctæ memoriæ Damafus, librum contra Helvidium de beatæ Mariæ virginitate perpetua scripsimus. Num vir egregius, et eruditus in Scripturis, et virgo, et Ecclesiæ virginis doctor, aliquid in illo sermone reprehendit? Ad Pamm. ep. 30. al. 50. T. iv. P. 2. p. 240. f.

^b Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 230. and his Life of Damafus, in the Appendix to the Lives of the primitive Fathers. Vol. ii. p. 30. Du Pin Bib. T. ii. p. 151. Tillem. Mem. T. viii. Pagi ann. 384. n. ii. iii. and Mr. Bower's History of the Bishops of Rome. Vol. i. p. 179—233.

^c Basilii Cæsareæ Cappadociæ, quæ

prius Mazaca vocabatur, Episcopus, egregios contra Eunomium elaboravit libros, et de Spiritu Sancto volumen, et in Hexameron homilias novem, et *Agonias*, et breves variosque tractatus. Moritur imperante Gratiano. De V. I. cap. 116.

^b Vid. Cav. H. L. Pagi Ann. 369. xvi. 370. ix. x. xxiii. 378. ii. Basnag. A. 370. n. vi. &c. 380. n. viii. ix. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 60. Du Pin. T. ii. p. 151. Tillem. Mem. T. ix. ^c Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 69. &c. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. ix. Du Pin. Bib. T. ii. p. 154. &c.

times quoted the first epistle of St. Peter, and the first epistle of St. John. The second epistle of St. Peter is once quoted 'in the fifth book against Eunomius, not allowed by all to be genuine. The epistle of St. James is very seldom quoted, the epistle of St. Jude, and the first and second epistle of St. John not at all, that I remember. Though there be very little notice taken of the book of the Revelation in his writings, I presume, it cannot be said to have been rejected by him: for in his second book against Eunomius, having before quoted St. John's gospel, i. 1. he adds: 'And' the same evangelist 'in another book says: *Which is, and Which was, even the Almighty.*' [Rev. i. 8.] The same text is also 'quoted in the fourth book against Eunomius. But that book is not universally allowed to be genuine, some thinking, that Basil wrote no more than three books against Eunomius. I would add, that 'Basil is named by Arethas among those who received the book of the Revelation as inspired scripture.

III. In St. Basil's second book against Eunomius is a very singular passage to this purpose. 'And^b writing to the Ephesians, as truly united to him *who is*, through knowledge, he called them in a peculiar sense *such who are*, saying: *To the saints who are, and [or even] the faithful in Christ Jesus.* For so those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in ancient copies.'

It is well known, that there is a question agitated of late among the learned, concerning the persons, to whom the epistle, called to the Ephesians, was written. But I do not now concern myself about that question: I am at present only desirous to settle, as far as I am able, the meaning of this passage of Basil; in which he has been supposed by some to say, that he had seen copies, in which the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, *at Ephesus*, were wanting. So particularly Dr. ⁱ Mill. But Mr. Lefant in his remarks^k upon Mill's New Testament, soon after its publication at Oxford, argues, that Basil does not say, those words, *at Ephesus*, were wanting in any copies. Ludolph Kuster in

^d Adv. Eunom. l. v. in. T. i. p. 296. D.

ο Αλλ' αὐτός ημῖν ο εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐν πληρῇ
 λόγῳ τῇ τοῦτοῦ — οὖν, καὶ ο ηγ, καὶ ο
 πατρὶστῆς. Adv. Eunom. l. ii. T. i. p.
 249. E. f. Καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκατάστασι

249. E. f Καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει.
 ὁ ων, καὶ ὁ γν, καὶ ὁ ἐργαζόμενος. Adv.

Eunom. l. iv. p. 282. A. & Vid. Areth. p. 640. ad calcem Commentar.

Alcibiades p. 640. ad calcem Commentar.
Œcumenii. T. ii. Ἡ Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς

Εφεστίοις επιτίλλων, ως γνησίως κηρύμτοις
τη οὐκ ἐπὶ ἐπιτίλλω, οὐκ αὐτὴς ἰδιόζωως

ἀνομασεν, ἔπειν· τοῖς ἀδίοις τοῖς ὄσι, καὶ
πίσις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησῷ. Οὐδὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐν
πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδυκάσι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς
παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀνίσταφιν εὐρηκαμέν, Adv.
Eunom. I. ii. p. 254. E.

i Ev. Εφ. 1. 1. Omittit Basil. l. ii. adv. Eunomium, fide patrum, quod dicit, ac veterum exemplarium. Mill. ad Eph. i. 1. Vid. de ejusdem Prolegom. n. 89.

* Bib. Choise. T. xvi. p. 301. &c.

the preface to his edition of Mill's New Testament, justifies Mill, and condemns Lenfant. But this learned author soon replied in a Latin¹ letter, vindicating the interpretation he had given of St. Basil. Mr. Wolff^m, who approved Mr. Lenfant's opinion, has given a very good account of his argument, with some additional observations of his own in support of it. And I must own, it seems to me likewise, that Mr. Lenfant's interpretation is the truest.

Says that ingenious writer, 'The^a various reading consists in the emphatical particle τοις, and not εν εφεσω, as may appear from these several considerations: 1. St. Basil moves not the question, whether that epistle be written to the Ephesians or others. 2. At the beginning of the passage, he supposeth that it was written to the Ephesians, without saying that there was any contest about it. 3. The design of Basil is to shew, that the Ephesians are justly and properly called ουτοις such who are, because of their union with him who is. 4. The word ιδιαιζωνως, peculiarly, must relate to the emphatical article τοις, which is necessary to answer to ο ων, him who is, and which, according to Mill's own account, is wanting in one ms. at least. This is the point: Τοις was wanting in the common copies in the time of St. Basil, but he had read it in ancient mss. and he avails himself of it, to authorize his speculation. It is true, that in his quotation he does not put the words at Ephesus, because that was not the thing in contest, and he had mentioned it before, and he had no occasion to mention it again. Moreover, he might be disposed to omit those words, at Ephesus, the^o more to favour his speculation upon τοις ουτοις, such who are, taken in an absolute sense. 5. St. Jerom, who refutes this speculation of St. Basil, makes it turn upon the particle τοις, and mentions not, any various reading upon the place.'

Let me enlarge a little farther, and agreeably, as I apprehend, to Lenfant's mind, though without transcribing him.

The passage of Jerom, just referred to, which is usually alleged, as illustrating the passage of Basil, in my opinion greatly favours Lenfant. Jerom^p in his comment upon the

¹ Bib. Choise. T. xxi. p. 96. &c.

^m Vid. Prolegom. in ep. ad Ephes. et in cap. i. p. 10—13. ap. Cur. Philol. T. iv.

^a See, as before, Bib. Ch. T. xvi. p. 301. &c.

^o Omisit potius eas, quod ex altera parte satis ipsi erat, articulum τοις ex antiquis exemplaribus tamquam necessarium vindicare. Ex altera vero intelligebat, expo-

sitionem suam pro nulla facile habitum in, si voces εν εφεσω voci ον subjecta legerentur. Wolf. Curæ. T. iv. p. 12. m.

^p Sanctis omnibus qui sunt Ephesi. Quidam curiosius quam necesse est, putant ex eo quod Moyse dictum sit: Hec dices filiis Israel: Qui est, misit me [Exod. iii. 14.] etiam eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles.

epistle to the Ephesians mentions Basil's speculation, or forced interpretation, which we have seen and rejects it. Not a few learned men think, that ^a Jerom has a particular reference to Basil; but I see no ground for that supposition. He might perhaps find that observation ^r in Origen, or Apollinarius, or Didymus, whose commentaries upon the epistle to the Ephesians he mentions in his preface, or in some others. In Basil this interpretation is produced as an argument against the Arians; but nothing of that kind appears in Jerom's account of it: however, Jerom's passage, as I said, favours Lenfant's opinion, that Basil does not say, those words *at Ephesus*, were wanting in his copies: because Jerom, mentioning the same interpretation, takes no notice of any various reading. On the contrary, he again and again supposeth the common reading. And he says, that some thought *the saints and faithful at Ephesus were said to be such as are*. But others, he says, without stopping at the expression, *such who are*, or without laying a stress upon that expression, understood the inscription in a plain manner, and continued sense, *to the saints and faithful who are at Ephesus*.

One thing more to be observed here, and not omitted by Lenfant ^a in his second letter upon this subject, is, that for two hundred years last past, and more, many manuscripts of the New Testament have been discovered, and the various readings have been diligently collected; but as yet there has not been one copy found to support Basil's account; supposing him to say, that the words *ἐν ἐφεσῷ* were wanting in his time, in the ancient copies, and that it had been so transmitted by those of former times: nor is there any version, to confirm that supposition. In a word, it appears to be incredible, that such a various reading, supposing it to have been in many copies in St. Basil's time, should have been totally lost. To which might be added, that there would have been notice taken of it by many remaining ancient writers, beside Basil.

If it should be said, that there are scarce any copies, that bear witness to our supposed various reading: I think, it may be fitly answered, that our various reading is a trifling thing;

essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos. Ut quomodo a sancto sancti, a iusto iusti, a sapientia sapientes: ita ab eo qui est, hi qui sunt appellantur, et juxta eundem Apostolum elegisse Deum ea quæ non erant, ut destrueret ea quæ erant. — Alii vero simpliciter, non ad eos qui sunt, sed qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptum arbitrantur. Hieron. in Eph. cap. i. T. iv. P. i. p. 323.

^a Vid. Benedictin. An-

not. ad Basil. loc. T. i. p. 254. not. i.

^r Denique Basilium hic tantum de articulo τοῖς ante ὡς cogitasse, ut suam posterioris vocis interpretationem ingeniose potius, quam vere stabiliret, ex Hieronymi, expositionem illam (sive apud Basilium, sive Origenem, Apollinarem et Didymum legitur,) averfantis, loco manifestum est. — Wolff. Curæ in ep. ad Eph. i. ver. i.

^s See Bib. ch. T. xxi. p. 112.

but a various reading in the words *ἐν ἐπιστῇ*, is very remarkable, and must have appeared in some remaining copies, if there had been many such in Basil's time.

I should not forget to observe, that ¹ elsewhere also Basil quotes this epistle with the title of the epistle to the Ephesians, without hesitation.

Upon the whole, it seems to me, that there is no reason to understand St. Basil to say, that *ἐν ἐπιστῇ*, at *Ephesus*, was wanting in any copies in his time.

And I imagine, that there were two ways in use among those, who fancied the forced interpretation, which we have seen in Basil. Some understood it thus, *To the saints who are, even the faithful in Christ Jesus at Ephesus*: others after this manner, *To the saints and faithful in Christ Jesus at Ephesus, who are*. The former seems to have been Basil's method, and the latter that of the persons mentioned by Jerom.

IV. I now proceed. St. Basil bears witness to the respect, which was all along paid by Christians to the sacred scriptures.

1. Upon Ps. lx. otherwise lix. 'If ^a any should say, this psalm was written to us, he would not say amiss: for the divine oracles are ours, and they are proposed to the church of God in every assembly, as gifts sent from God, containing nourishment for the soul, afforded by the Spirit.'

2. In a homily, containing an exhortation to baptism, having ^x quoted a text of Isaiah, of the Psalms, the Acts, and St. Matthew, he says, 'For all these were in to-day's reading.'

3. The usefulness of the divine scriptures is shewn by him in a homily upon the first Psalm: 'All ^y scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable, and for that end was written by the Spirit, that ^z as in a common treasury of medicines for souls, all men might find what is proper for the healing of their several maladies. The prophets teach some things, the historical books other things, the law others: and the Proverbs have instructions for regulating our manners. The book of Psalms contains whatever is useful in all the rest.'

4. In a letter to Gregory Nazianzen: 'The ^a best way to know our duty is to meditate on the divinely inspired scriptures: here are instructions concerning our conduct; and the

^a Γραφὴν ὁ ἀποστόλος πρὸς Εφεσίους φησιν·
Ἀλλήθενότις δὲ ἐν ἀσάπῃ. κ. λ. [cap. iv. 15.]
De Sp. Sto. cap. v. n. 9. T. iii. p. 8. A.

^y Hom. in Ps. lix. T. i. p. 190. E.

^x Σὺ δὲ, διὰ προφητῶν διδασκόμενος —
διὰ ψαλμῶν νουθετούμενος — δι' ἀποστόλων
ἐκτελεζόμενος — ὑπ' αὐτῆς τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὴν

λαμβάνομενος, λεγούσης. — Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα
σημεῖον συνειδήσεως πρὸς τὴν ἀναίρεσιν. Hom.
in sanct. bapt. T. ii. p. 114. B. C.

^y In Ps. i. T. i. p. 90. A. B.

^z — ὡς περὶ ἐν κοινῇ τῶν ψυχῶν ἰατρικῇ.
^a Ad Gregor. Ep. ii. al. 1. T. iii. p. 74.

examples of good men recorded therein, are as it were living patterns, set before us for our imitation. And whatever malady any man labours under, if he acquaints himself with the scriptures, he will there find a medicine suited to his case.

5. In a letter to a woman of condition, who was a widow, and had sought to him for counsel, he says, 'If^b you attend to the consolations of the divine scriptures, you will neither need my advice, nor the advice of any other, the directions of the Holy Ghost being sufficient to lead you into a right conduct.'

6. To another widow of quality he writes: 'And^c by you I salute your good daughter, and I exhort her to live in the meditation of the oracles of the Lord, that by their excellent institution her mind may be nourished, and improve more than her body does according to the course of nature.'

According to Basil therefore, the scriptures might be profitably read by all sorts of people.

7. I might add other passages, where he says, all^d things are to be proved by the scriptures. And^e whatever appears agreeable to the divinely inspired scriptures, let that be received by us as true. He likewise says, that^f hearers well acquainted with the scriptures, ought to examine what is said by their teachers; and to embrace what is agreeable to the scriptures, and to reject what is otherwise. If any should say, that Basil speaks only of such as are 'well acquainted with the scriptures;' I think it may be justly answered, that Basil's rule is general. All ought to be well acquainted with the scriptures, and may be so, if they will but seriously endeavour it.

^b Ep. 283. al. 284. p. 424. D. E.

^c Ep. 296. al. 285. T. iii. p. 434. B.

^d Οἱ δὲ πάντες ἡμᾶς, ἡ πρᾶξις πειρασθῆναι τῆς μαθήσεως τῆς θεοπνευστῆς γραφῆς. κ. λ. Moral. Reg. 26. T. ii. p. 256. B. C.

^e Οὐκ ἐν τῇ θεοπνευστῇ ἡμῖν διαίτησιν γραφῇ καὶ παρ' οἷς ἀν' ἐνέβη ταῦτα δογματίζονται τοῖς θεοῖς λόγοις, ἐπὶ τούτοις πάντως

τῆς ἀληθείας ἡ ψευδὴς. Ep. 189. al. 80. T. iii. p. 277. E. Vid. et Moral. Reg. 80. c. 22.

^f Οἱ δὲ τῶν ἀκροῶν τῆς παιδείας τῆς γραφῆς, δοκιμάζοντες τὰ παρὰ τῶν διδασκάλων λόγια, καὶ τὰ μὴ σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς διχισθῆναι, τὰ δὲ ἀλλότρια ἀποβάλλειν. κ. λ. Moral. Reg. 72. cap. I.

C H A P. XCVIII.

GREGORY NAZIANZEN.

I. *His time.* II. *A catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, with remarks.* III. *General titles and division of scripture.* IV. *Selected passages.*

THOUGH Jerom's chapter concerning Gregory Nazianzen be somewhat long, I cannot forbear to transcribe ^a the greatest part of it: but I shall not translate it. In the general, I observe, that Jerom celebrates Gregory's eloquence, and calls him his master, whom he had heard interpreting the scriptures: of which he likewise speaks ^b elsewhere. He also mentions several of his works; and says, he had died about three years before. For fuller accounts of Gregory's life and works, I refer to ^c several.

It is, I think, generally allowed, that Gregory flourished about the year 370, and afterwards. But learned men are not agreed about the time of his birth, and the age at which he died. Cave says he was born about the time of the Nicene council, and died in 389, and about the 65th year of his age. With whom Bafnage ^d agrees, supposing, that Gregory might be born in 326. But Suidas expressly says, that ^e Gregory

^a Gregorius, primum Sasimorum, deinde Nazianzenus Episcopus, vir eloquentissimus, præceptor meus, quo Scripturas explanante didici, ad triginta millia versuum omnia opera sua composuit. E quibus illa sunt: De morte fratris Cæsarii. Περὶ φιλοπρωχίας. Laudes Maccabæorum. Laudes Cypriani. Laudes Athanasii—et liber, hexametro versu, Virginitatis et Nuptiarum contra se differentium. Adversum Eunomium liber unus. De Spiritu Sancto liber unus. Contra Julianum Imperatorem libri duo. Sequutus est autem Polemonem dicendi charactere. Vivoque se Episcopum in loco suo ordinans, ruri vitam monachi exercuit. Decessitque ante hoc ferme triennium sub Theodosio Principe. De V. I. cap. 117.

^b — sine causa Gregorium Nazianzenum et Didymum in Scripturis sanctis catechistas habui. Ad Domnion. ep. 32. al. 51. T. iv. p. 245. in.

Numquid in illa epistola Gregorium virum eloquentissimum non potui nominare? Quis apud Latinos par sui est? Quo ego

magistro glorior et exulto. Adv. Ruf. l. i. p. 363. m.

Præceptor quondam meus Gregorius Nazianzenus, rogatus a me ut exponeret, quid sibi vellet in Luca Sabbathum designari, id est, secundoprimum, eleganter lusit: Docebo te, inquit, super hac re in ecclesia, in qua mihi omni populo accedente, cogeris invitatus scire quod nescis. &c. Ad Nepotian. ep. 34. al. 2. p. 266.

Et præceptor meus Gregorius Nazianzenus virginitatem et nuptias differens Graecis versibus explicavit. Adv. Jovin. l. i. p. 157.

^c Cav. H. L. P. i. p. 246. Du Pin Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 201. &c. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. ix. Bafnage. Ann. 373. xvi.—xix. et alibi. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 507. &c. ^d Ann. 373. n. xvi.

^e Ελασας δὲ περὶ τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ καὶ ἀποστολικά, Θεοδοσίῳ τριῶν καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει ἀποβίβας, κατέλαυνε τὸν βίον. Suid. V. Γρηγορίου.

died

died in the 13th of the emperor Theodosius, [or the year of our Lord 391], when he was above 90 years of age. This has induced Pagi to argue, and with some appearance of truth, that ^f Gregory was born in 301, and died in 391: nor does Jerom, as he thinks, contradict, but confirm this account, when he says, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, that Gregory had died three years before. For he says, that Jerom did not publish that work till the 15th year of Theodosius, the year of our Lord 393; and, understanding those three years to be incomplete on both sides, Gregory died, according to him, in 391. This opinion has been embraced by ^k I. A. Fabricius; and in his notes upon the 117th chapter of Jerom's fore-cited work, seems to suppose ^b it the general opinion of learned men at present. And indeed I observe, that ^l the late Mr. Le Clerc readily followed Pagi therein. But all do not: S. Basnage ^k argues strongly against Pagi, and supposeth that he confutes him. Tillemont ^l, after weighing arguments on both sides, still inclines to the other opinion, as most probable, and thinks, that Gregory was born in 329, or thereabout.

Indeed, the opinion of Pagi is attended with several great difficulties: first, he is obliged to allow, that ^m Gregory was thirty years at Athens, and did not leave it before the 55th or 56th year of his age; which is very strange. Secondly, the intimate friendship of Gregory and Basil, seems to imply their being of near the same age: it is, I think, generally allowed, that ⁿ Basil was born in 328 or 329, or thereabout; if Gregory was a little older than Basil, and survived him some years, that will make little difference. Thirdly, Jerom mentions the time of Gregory's death; if he had reached to the age of ninety years, that being a remarkable circumstance, he could not have avoided mentioning that also. Fourthly, if Gregory had been ninety years of age when he died, it would have been taken notice of by many writers before Suidas.

II. Among the poems of Gregory Nazianzen, there is one, which contains a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, and is to this purpose;

'Meditate^a and discourse much on the word of God. . . .

'But as there are many falsely ascribed writings, tending to

^f Vid. Ann. 354. xi.—xiii. 389. n. Bib. Ecc. ^l Bibl. univ. T. 18. p. 2, 3.
iv. v. ^g Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. ^k Ann. 373. n. xvi. et 390. n. ix.
308. ^h Cum Hieronymus A. 392. ^l S. Greg. de Naz. art. i. viii. et note
hunc librum scripserit, putavit is Nazian-
zenum exstinctum A. 389. Sed viri docti iv. Mem. T. ix. ^m Ann. 354. n. xii.
malunt assentiri Suidæ, qui ait obiisse anno ⁿ See S. Basile. Du Pin. T. ii. p. 154.
xiii. Theodosii Magni, hoc est, Christi and S. Basile art. i. et note 1. Tillem.
391. ætatis 90. Ad Hieron. cap. 117. ap. Mem. ix. ^o Carm. 33. T. ii. p. 98.

‘ deceive, accept, my friend, this certain number. There
 ‘ are twelve historical books of the most ancient Hebrew wis-
 ‘ dom: the first Genesis, then Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers,
 ‘ Deuteronomy; the next Joshua, the Judges, Ruth the eighth,
 ‘ the ninth and tenth the Acts of the Kings, and then the Re-
 ‘ mains, and Esdras the last. Then the five books in verse,
 ‘ the first Job, next David, then the three books of Solomon,
 ‘ Ecclesiastes, the Song, and the Proverbs. The prophetic
 ‘ books are five: the twelve prophets are one book, Hosea,
 ‘ Amos, Micah, Joel, Jonah, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk,
 ‘ Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; all these make
 ‘ one book: the second is Isaiah, then Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and
 ‘ Daniel. Which^r make twenty-two books, according to the
 ‘ number of the Hebrew letters. The^a books of the New
 ‘ Testament are as follows: Matthew wrote for the Hebrews,
 ‘ Mark for the Italians, Luke for the Greeks, for all that
 ‘ great herald John, enlightened with the heavenly mysteries.
 ‘ Next the Acts of the apostles; fourteen epistles of Paul;
 ‘ seven catholic epistles, which are these, one of James, two
 ‘ of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, which is the seventh.
 ‘ If^r there are any besides, they are not among the genuine.’

1. I scarce need to make remarks upon any parts of this catalogue. The reader is able to do it of himself.

2. The number of the books of the Old Testament is exactly according to the Hebrews: but the book of Esther is not particularly mentioned. The catalogue of the books of the New Testament contains all those, which are now commonly received, except the book of the Revelation. And there is no notice taken of any later books as having the least title to make a part of the Christian canon.

3. I would not deny, that Gregory supposed Matthew to have written his gospel in Hebrew; though his manner of expression does not necessarily imply it: for he says, that Mark ‘ wrote for the Italians;’ and yet, undoubtedly, he allowed him to have written in Greek: he seems therefore only to intimate, that Matthew published his gospel in Judea, Mark his in Italy, and Luke his in Achaia, or Greece. There^r is another passage of Gregory, in which he speaks of the places,

Ρ Αρχαίως μὲν ἐβήκα δύν καὶ εἰκοσι βί-
 βλους.

ἡ Μαίβαιος μὲν ἐβράβην ἑβραίοις δαυμάτι
 Χρίστῳ.

Μαρκὸς δ’ Ἰταλῶν, Λεκάας Ἀχαιῶν.

Πασι δ’ Ἰωάννης κερύξ μετὰς ἑρμηνεύου.

ἢ Εἰ τι δε τῶν ἐκτός, ἢ ἐν γένει.

ἢ Εἰς Πέρην ἢ Ἰνδοῖα, τὶ Παύλῳ κερύ
 πρὸς τὰ ἑβρῶν, Λεκά πρὸς Ἀχαιοῖν, αὐτῶν
 πρὸς ἡπειρῶν, Ἰωάννῃ πρὸς ἑβραῖον.—Μάρ-
 κῳ πρὸς Ἰταλίαν.—Orat. 25. T. i. p.
 438. A. B.

where

where several of Christ's apostles preached, that will countenance this supposition.

4. Whether Gregory Nazianzen received the book of the Revelation, is doubted: if this poem be his, as is generally supposed, it may be argued, that he did not receive it. Baronius¹ gives him up, and reckons him with Basil, Nyssen, and other Greeks, whom he supposes not to have received it. Andrew of Cæsarea, in his Commentary upon the book of the Revelation, names Gregory among others, by whom it was received: as does Arethas likewise. But James Basnage thinks² this poem to be of greater value for shewing Gregory's opinion, than the testimony of Andrew: nevertheless, I think, Andrew's testimony ought not to be quite neglected. Moreover, we find the Revelation twice quoted in³ Gregory's remaining works.

5. I do not intend to translate or transcribe any more of Gregory's poems; but it may not be amiss to put down here the titles of some of⁴ them: Of the twelve apostles; Of Christ's genealogy [as in Matthew and Luke]; The miracles of Christ according to Matthew; Christ's parables and similitudes according to Matthew; Christ's miracles according to John;

¹ Quod vero idem auctor [Hieronymus] affirmat suis temporibus Græcorum ecclesias non recipere Joannis Apocalypsin. — Certe inter Græcos scriptores ecclesiasticos, eisdemque Catholicos, qui Hieronymi ætate vixere, Epiphanius — non huic veritati ad stipulatur, sed non ab aliis quam hæreticis Alogis tradit impugnatum esse Joannis Apocalypsin. Cæterum nequaquam putandum, Hieronymum ea temere effuisse, aut Græcorum ecclesias calumniatum esse. Sed ea in re visus est habuisse respectum ad sanctum Basilium, Amphilo- chium, Gregorium Nazianzenum, atque Nyssenum, qui visi sunt ab eisdem interdum abstinuisse. Nam ipse Gregorius Nazianzenus, dum texuit catalogum librorum canonicorum, nullam penitus de Apocalypsi Joannis habuit mentionem, sicut nec Concilium Laodicenum — Et Amphilo-chius, æqualis Basilii atque Gregorii, in carmine ad Sc-leucum, quo textit catalogum canonicorum librorum, hæc in fine habet.

Asi Apocalypsin Joannis aliqui Is inferunt. Rursus, sed longe plurimi Adulterinam dicunt.

Baron. Ann. 97. n. vi.

² Gregoire de Nazianze, qui dressa dans ce tems la un canon des Ecritures, passoit l'Apocalypse sous silence: cequ'il n'auroit pas fait, s'il avoit reçu dans le canon des

Ecritures. Sixte de Sienne [Bib. Sacr. l. viii. c. x.] et plusieurs autres, éblouis par l'autorité d'André de Cæsarée, comptent toujours Gregoire de Nazianze entre les défenseurs de l'Apocalypse. Mais il est inutile de chercher son sentiment dans les écrits d'autrui, puisque son ouvrage est entre les mains de tout le monde, par lequel on peut juger plus sûrement. Et puisque Gregoire finit son canon des Ecritures à la lettre de S. Jude, et qu'il declare, que tous les livres, dont il ne parle point, sont suspects et douteux, il faut qu'il ait mis l'Apocalypse, dont il ne parle pas, au rang des livres, qui n'avoient point de caracteres sensibles de leur divinité. Bilius attribue à Gregoire de Nazianze des vers iambes, qui sont plutôt d'Amphilochius, évêque d'Icône. Car il n'y a point d'apparence, que Gregoire eut fait deux fois le canon des Ecritures dans ses vers. Ja. Basn. Hist. de l'Egl. l. viii. ch. 7. p. 435.

³ Πρὸς δὲ τῆς ἐφεστῆας ἀγρίτης· Πειθα-
μαι γὰρ ἀλλῆς ἀλλῆς προσαίνοι ἐκκλησιας,
ὡς Ἰωάννης διδάσκει μὴ διὰ τῆς ἀποκαλυφ-
ως. Or. 32. T. i. p. 516. C.

Καὶ ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ πν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, καὶ
ὁ παῖς καὶ ἡ ἀνὴρ. [Apoc. cap. i. 8.] Or.
35. p. 573. D.

⁴ Catm. xxxvi. — xlv. T. ii. p. 99 — 105.

Christ's

Christ's miracles according to Luke; Christ's parables according to Luke; Christ's miracles according to Mark; The parables of the four Evangelists.

III. General titles and divisions of books of scripture, in Gregory, are such as these: The ^a Law, Prophets, Christ. We are ^b taught by reason, the Law, Prophets and Apostles. The Law ^c and Grace, Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists. Prophetical ^d and apostolical books.

IV. I shall observe a few select passages.

1. He ^e calls Christ the first martyr.

2. He has a criticism ^f upon Acts ii. 8. It seems, that some questioned, whether the miracle of the gift of tongues was in the speaker or the hearers.

3. The ^g apostle says [Eph. ii. 3.] *And we were by nature children of wrath*; not meaning, as Gregory says, on account of our nature, but that sinners are really liable to wrath. So Judas was *the son of perdition*, on account of those evil actions which bring perdition upon men.

4. Gregory ^h quotes 1 John v. 7. without the heavenly witnesses, mentioning only these three witnesses, *the Spirit, water, and blood*.

5. The Christians ⁱ he says, when in power, did not persecute the heathens, as the heathens had persecuted them. In another place he says, that ^k religion ought to be free, and that the Christian law compels none, and that violence is not suited to promote the true interest of religion.

6. Nevertheless, Gregory seems not to have understood the genuine principles of reasonable and Christian moderation toward men of different sentiments; for in a letter written to Nectarius bishop of Constantinople, in the year 385, or soon after, he speaks of it as ^l the greatest calamity to the church,

^a Παραβολαι των τεσσαρων ευαγγελιστων. Carm. xlv. p. 103—105.

^b Or. 18. p. 276. A.

^c Or. 3. p. 76. B. C.

^d Αι προφητικαι δι και αποστολικαι βιβλοι μοι αι ανεληγισθων. Or. 4. p. 127. A.

^e — αυτων των Χριστου παθηματων, τα οποία μαρτυρος επι τον ταυρον ανεληγοσας. Or. 18. p. 276. A.

^f Or. 4. p. 715. D.

^g Και ημει φυσικι τεκνα ορθης, η καλα φυσιν λεγων· αλλ· οτι η αληθεια υπικυνησι ορθης τυχευασιν οι αμαρτανους. Και περι του Ιουδα γιραφται, οτι υιος απωλειας: Απολειας δι υιον αυτου ειπε, τω τα της απωλειας επιπραχιναι. Or. 47. T. i. p. 724. C.

^h Τις δει ο Ιωαννης;

τρεις ειναι τος μαρτυρους λεγων η τρις εν θεολογικαις, το πνευμα, το υδωρ, τι αιμα, αρα ληρον φανειναι; Or. 36. p. 603. D.

ⁱ Or. 3. p. 95. B. C.

^k Επειδεν μη προς βιαν αγειν, τα ημετερα νομι, αλλ· ατακτως, αλλ· ιεροως — της δι ημεραν, εκ αρχην, αλλα πασιδωδωσιν, και παντων μαλιστα συντηρει το ιεουσιν. Βολυμην γαρ, η τυραννουμεν, το της ιουδαιας μυστηριον. Or. 8. p. 148. D. 145. A.

^l Το δι πασιν χαλιπωλαιοις εν ταις εκκλησιαστικαις συμφοραις, η των απωλειων ενι παντησια, ως εκ οιδας πως παραιοι σε εσοδης πορισαμενης καυλοισ το σπασιν ομολογως ημιν εξισιαν. Ad Nectar. Or. 46. T. i. p. 721. D.

that the Apollinarists (whose errors were purely speculative), were permitted to assemble together, as freely as the catholics. To suffer this, and let them teach and preach their doctrines freely, he says, is equivalent to an approbation of their errors, and a condemnation of the truth. And he earnestly desires Nectarius to admonish the emperor [Theodosius], and let him know, that all he had hitherto done for the churches would avail nothing, if this evil were suffered. A large part of this letter is inserted by Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History.

7. Gregory asserts the doctrine of free-will.
8. He speaks, as if many miracles were then wrought by the reliques of martyrs.

9. Gregory in several places speaks with great freedom of the synods of bishops. As those places have been often taken notice of by learned men, I have thought it best to refer to them.

C H A P. XCIX.

AMPHILOCHIUS, BISHOP OF ICONIUM.

I. His history, and works. II. A catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament. III. A Law of Theodosius against Heretics, procured by him, with Remarks.

I. AMPHILOCHIUS bishop of Iconium, the chief city of Lycaonia, is in Jerom's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers: where, however, he mentions but one book of his, concerning the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, not now extant.

Amphilochius was a native of Cappadocia. The exact time of his being constituted bishop of Iconium is not known:

—το λαβειν αυτης εξουσιαν συναξειως, εδιν
τιμον εστιν, η αληθευειν τε καθ' ημας δογμα-
τις νομισθηται. Ει γαρ ως ευσεβειν εις εκεινοι
διδασκειν ως φρονεσι, και κηρυττειν εν παρ-
ρησια το καθ' αυτης επιρρησιαις δογμα, δη-
λον οτι καλιστα εστι ο της εκκλησιας λοφος,
ως της αληθειας παρ' αυτουσ υσης. Ib. p.
722. D. — και διδαξαι τον
ευσεβειαν βασιλεια, οτι εδιν κερδος εστι
της λαιτης αυτη περι της εκκλησιας σπουδης,
ει το τοις κακοις επικαθαιρεσι της υσαι-
ματος περιως δια της παρρησιας αυτων κα-

ισχυου. Ibid. p. 723. A.
L. vi. cap. 26. p Or. 1. p. 9. A.
Or. 3. p. 77. A. Vid. et Or. 1. p.
35. B. Vid. Ep. 55. et Carm. x.
Conf. Ep. 65. 71, 72.
Amphilochius, Iconii Episcopus, nuper
mihi librum legit de Spiritu Sancto, quod
Deus est, et quod adorandus, quodque om-
nipotens sit. De V. I. cap. 133.
Quo anno Iconiensi Ecclesie sit, 371,
vel 375, non satis liquet. S. Basnag. Ann.
394. n. ix.

Cave

Cave^c says in 370, or somewhat later: Tillemont^d about the year 374. He^e was alive in 394; and it is supposed, that he died not long after.

His^f eminence is collected from the several letters written to him by Basil, from the character given of him by^g Theodoret, and others. And Jerom in his letter to Magnus joins^h him with Basil, Gregory, and others, who were equally skilful in secular learning, and the sacred scriptures.

Accounts of his works may be seen in divers writers, referred to at the bottom of the pages of this chapter; but very few of his worksⁱ remain: I take particular notice of but one only.

II. It is an iambic poem of considerable length, addressed to Seleucus, in which is inserted a catalogue of the books of the Old and the New Testament. It has been ascribed by many to Amphilocheus; but some learned men are of opinion, that it was written by Gregory Nazianzen: they say, the style is his; and that we have no knowledge, that Amphilocheus ever wrote verse. Cave^k and^l Du Pin therefore say, it is Gregory's. On the other hand, Combes^m andⁿ Tillemont still maintain the right of Amphilocheus, to whom it is ascribed in manuscript copies, and by some ancient authors: moreover, they observe several differences in this catalogue from the preceding. Bishop Beveridge^o puts down both these poems distinctly, calling one, that of Gregory the divine, and the other,

^c Circa annum 370, vel forsan paulo se-
rius, Iconiæ, Lycaoniæ metropolis Episcopus
constituitur. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 251.

^d S. Amphiloque Art. iii. Mem. T. ix.
^e Vid. Tillem. ubi supr. Art. vi. et Pagi
Ann. 394. n. vii. ^f See Tillem. as above.
Art. i.

^g H. E. l. iv. c. 30. l. v.
c. 8. et 16. Socrat. l. v. cap. 8. Sozom.
l. vii. c. 6. et 9.

^h — Cappa-
documque Basilii, Gregorii, Amphilochei.
Qui omnes in tantum Philosophorum doc-
trinis atque sententiis suos infarciunt libros:
ut nescias, quid in illis primum admirari
debeas, eruditionem seculi, an scientiam
Scripturarum. Ep. 83. al. 84.

ⁱ Præter fragmenta quædam Veterum
inæquentis disseminata, unum forte Am-
philochei genuinum opus super est, Epistola
Synodica, quam Cotelerius edidit. [Ap.
Monum. Gr. T. ii. p. 99—104.] Balnag.
Ann. 394. n. ix. Conf. Cav. H. L.

Il suffit de dire, que tout ce que nous
avons aujourd'hui d'entier de ce Saint, est
la lettre aux Evêques Macedoniens — et
un poëme qu'il adressa à Seleuque neveu
de Sainte Olympiade. &c. Tillem. Mem.

T. ix. St. Amphiloque, art. vi.

^k Ad Seleucum Iambi Gregorio Naz.
a Billio adjudicari, nec invita quidem veni-
tate. Cav. H. L. in Amphiloche.

^l Le poëme à Seleucus, quoiqu'en dise
le Pere Combes, est du stile de saint Gre-
goire, et il y a bien de l'apparence, qu'il
a été composé par ce Pere sous le nom
d'Amphiloque. Du Pin Bib. T. ii. p. 234.

^m — Sunt nihilominus hæc leviora,
quam ut fidem codicum vindicantium Am-
philochei nostro elevent. Primum enim,
minus quadrant hic posita de libris canonicis,
cum iis quæ habet Theologus carmine de
iisdem p. 98. ed. Par. ubi absolute pro-
nuntiat de Pauli epistolis, et septem Catho-
licis, nulla mentione libri Esther, aut Apo-
calypsis. — Etiam Balsamon habet ut Am-
philochei p. 1080. ed. Paris. passimque
Damasceus in elementis in codice Eminen-
tiss. Rupifucaldii. Combes. not. ad Am-
phil. p. 254.

ⁿ See Mem. Ecc.
T. ix. S. Greg. de Naz. § 110. Amphi-
loque § 6. et note 6.

^o Synodicon
T. ii. p. 178, 179.

that of Amphilochius from his iambics to Seleucus: and some others are of ^p the same opinion. Whether it belongs to one, or the other, it is a different performance from the forgoing, and therefore deserves to be put down here.

‘ The author of this poem recommends ^a the reading of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as fitted to teach men virtue, and the right worship of God. Then ^r he cautions his friend against spurious, and falsely ascribed writings, even though they have in them some appearance of truth. After ^s which he enumerates the divinely inspired books, and in the first place those of the Old Testament, which are these: The Pentateuch, containing first Genesis, then Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. Then Joshua, and the Judges, and Ruth, four books of the Kingdoms, two of the Remains, the first and second of Esdras. After them five books in verse, Job, the book of Psalms, three books of Solomon, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs. To these add the Twelve Prophets, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. After whom are the four Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel. To these some add Esther. The books of the New Testament to be received by you are these: Four Evangelists only, Matthew, then Mark, the third Luke, and John ^t the fourth in time, but first in the sublimity of his doctrine. Next ^u receive a second book of Luke, the book of the Acts of all the Apostles. Then fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, and to Titus and Philemon, to each one, and one to the Hebrews. But ^x some say, the epistle to the Hebrews is spurious; not speaking rightly, for it is a genuine work. Then the catholic epistles: Of which some receive seven, others three only: one of James, one of Peter, one of John: whilst others receive three of John, and

^p See the opinions of Baronius and Bafnage, in the preceding chapter note t and ^u. And see Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 503, 504. ^q Amphil. ad Seleuc. p. 126. ed. Combef. Paris. 1644. et ap. Greg. Naz. T. ii. p. 194, 195.

^r Εἰσι γὰρ, εἰσι ἐσθ' οἱ ψευδοῦνται βιβλοὶ τινὲς μὲν ἐμμεσοὶ, καὶ γνήσιαι, ὡς αἱ εἰσὶ τῶν ἀληθείας λόγων.
p. 130. Gr. 194.

^a Τέλει χάρις σοι τῶν θεοπειρωτῶν ἐργῶν βιβλῶν ἐκαστῇ.—Ib.

^t — ἀριθμῶν τῶν ἰωάννου χρόνῳ Τετραβίων· ἀλλὰ πρῶτον νῦν δογματῶν.
p. 132.

^u Δεχῶ δὲ βιβλὸν Λευκα, καὶ τὴν δευτέραν, τὴν τῶν καθολικῶν πρᾶξιων ἀποστολῶν.
Ib.

^x Τινες δὲ φασὶ τὴν πρὸς ἑβραίους νοθὸν· Οὐκ ἐν λεγούσις, γνησία γὰρ ἡ χάρις. Ib.

‘ two of Peter, and Jude’s, the seventh. The Revelation
 ‘ of John is approved by some; but many [or the most] say
 ‘ it is spurious. Let this be the most certain canon of the
 ‘ divinely inspired scriptures.’

I shall make but one remark upon this poem, and what has been transcribed from it: That it affords a new proof of the care and caution of the ancient Christians concerning books received as a part of sacred scripture, and the rule of their faith.

III. As very little of Amphilocheus remains, I have no select passages to present the reader with at the end of this chapter. I shall therefore put down here a story told by ^a Theodoret; which is also in ^a Sozomen and ^b Nicephorus, with only some variations. Amphilocheus, as Theodoret says, presented a petition to Theodosius, desiring him to prohibit Arian assemblies, without obtaining it. He therefore thought of a method to gain his point. And being in the palace with other bishops, he paid his respects to Theodosius, as usual, taking little or no notice of Arcadius, who stood by, and had been lately declared Augustus. The emperor supposing the omission might have proceeded from forgetfulness, called to Amphilocheus, and put him in mind to salute his son also: Amphilocheus answered, he had paid respect to him, and that was enough. The emperor displeased with that answer said, a slight put upon his son was an indignity to himself. Whereupon Amphilocheus replied; You see, Sir, that you cannot endure a slight to be put upon your son, and are angry with those who are guilty of it: persuade yourself, then, that the God of the whole world is offended with those who blaspheme his only begotten Son, and hates them as ungrateful to their Saviour and benefactor. The emperor perceiving the bishop’s design, soon after this forbade the assemblies of heretics. Intending, it is likely, a law of ^c Theodosius still extant, dated July 25, of the year 383, prohibiting all heretics, particularly Eunomians, Arians, and Macedonians, to hold any assemblies of worship in public places, or private houses.

This affair has been taken notice of by several ^d moderns; and seems to be rightly placed in the year 383, it happening after that Arcadius had been declared Augustus, and joined

^a Την δ' αποκαλυψιν την Ιωαννης παλιν
 Τινες μιν εβριμωσι, και πολλους δε γε
 Νοθου λεγουσιν: Ουλος αψευδιστος
 Κανων ων ειη των θιοσκειψων γραφων.
 p. 134.

^a L. v. c. 16. p. 218.
 vii. c. 6.

^b Soz. l. xii. c. 9.

^c Cod. Theod. 16. Tit. 5. L. xi.

^d See Cave's Lives of the Primitive Fathers. Vol. ii. in Gregory Naz. sect. vii. p. 327, 328. H. L. T. i. p. 251. Balsag. Ana. 383. n. vii. Tillem. Les Ariens. art. 139. Mem. Tom. vi.

with his father in the empire; which was done in the beginning of that year.

Amphilochius shewed his dislike of heretics several ways. He wrote a book against the Massalians, mentioned by ^a Theodoret; and another work, intitl'd 'Of Pseudepigraphal books compos'd by heretics; both which are lost: if they had been extant, I suppose they would have given me more satisfaction than the law of Theodosius, which affords not any argument. Indeed, I do not think, that Amphilochius is to be commend'd for procuring that law; I rather think that he therein acted contrary to the doctrine taught by our Saviour, which inculcates mutual equity and forbearance, and to many apostolical precepts, requiring bishops, and all Christians in general, *to be gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men: to be gentle unto all men, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves, if peradventure God will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.* The catholics had suffered many hardships in the late reign of Valens: afterwards, in the reigns of Gratian and Theodosius they came into power. If they had more truth on their side, than the Arians, I wish, they had also excelled in moderation and equity; which are shining virtues, highly becoming weak and fallible creatures one toward another, perfectly consistent with a zeal for truth, and better suited to promote its interests, than force and violence.

C H A P. C.

GREGORY, BISHOP OF NYSSA IN CAPPADOCIA.

I. *His time and history.* II. *His testimony to the scriptures.* III. *Selected passages.*

I. GREGORY, younger brother of Basil, was ordained bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia in the ^a latter part of the year 370, or in ^b 371, or ^c the beginning of 372. Being a zealous homou-sian, he ^d felt the heavy hands of the Arian administration un-

^a Hær. Fab. l. iv. cap. xi.

^b Vid. Cav. H. L. T. ii. p. 253. et Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 505.

^c Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 244.

^d Vid. Benedictin. Vit. S. Basil. c. xix.

^e Vid. Pagi Ann. 369. n. xvii. Fabr.

Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 144. Tillem. Gr. Nyss. art. iii.

^f Vid. Cav. ib. p. 244. in. Tillem. Mem. T. ix. S. Greg. de

Nyffe. art. iv.

der Valens: and some time after his ordination was obliged to live in exile, in an unsettled condition, till upon the death of Valens, he and others were restored to their sees by an edict of Gratian in 378. He^e is in Jerom's Catalogue; I place the chapter, which is short, below. He was alive^f in 394; the year of his death is not certainly known. I formerly^g made large extracts out of our Gregory's oration upon the life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, to which the reader is referred: I now proceed to take his testimony to the scriptures of the Old and the New Testament.

II. 1. He speaks^h of the five divisions of the book of Psalms.

2. He takes notice ofⁱ the ancient versions of the Old Testament, of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, beside that of the Seventy: in^k one place he consults the Hebrew.

3. 'A^l greater than Solomon made use of him as an instrument, and by him speaks to us first in the Proverbs, then in the Ecclesiastes, and after that in the philosophy of the Canticles now before us.' So speaks Gregory in the first of his fifteen homilies upon the book of Canticles: who has also a preface to that book, and eight homilies upon the book of Ecclesiastes; and he here plainly shews us, what were generally esteemed by understanding Christians the genuine writings of Solomon.

4. I need not take any notice of quotations of the gospels. He gives^m the title of the great John to the evangelist, quoting the beginning of his first epistle, soon after he had quoted the beginning of his gospel.

5. The book of the Acts is very often quoted by him, and ascribed toⁿ Luke. Moreover he says, that^o Luke was as much a physician of souls, as of the body: from whence we can conclude, that he took the evangelist to be the same who is mentioned Col. iv. 14.

6. Gregory^p quotes the epistle to the Ephesians with that title.

^e Gregorius Nyssenus Episcopus, frater Basilii Cæsariensis, ante paucos annos mihi et Gregorio Nazianzeno contra Eunomium legit libros, qui et multa alia scripsisse et scribere dicitur. De V. I. cap. 128.

^f Vid. Pagi Ann. 394. n. vi.

^g Vol. iii. p. 27—33.

^h In Psalm. Tr. 1. cap. ix. T. i. p. 287. D.

ⁱ In Hexaem T. i. p. 7. B. p. 13. B. C.

^k In Cant. hom. 9. T. i. p. 610. C.

^l Οὗτος εἶπεν τῷ σολομωνι τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ σαλμωνος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν διακρίσιν, πρὸς τὸν ἐν παροιμίαις, εἶτα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ προκείμενῇ τῇ αἰνέσει

τῶν αἰνέσεων φιλοσοφία. κ. λ. In Cant. hom. 1. T. i. p. 475. D.

^m Οὗτος δὲ καὶ ὁ μέγας Ἰωάννης ἐπιτοίχηκεν. In Cant. hom. 13. T. i. p. 664. C.

ⁿ Ἡ φωνὴ ἐν ἀρχῇ τῇ βίβλῳ τῶν πρᾶξεων ὁ Ἀνακ. κ. λ. In Christ. Resurr. Or. 2. T. iii. p. 415. C.

^o Οὗτοι οὖν Ἀνακ. οὗτοι τῶν ψυχῶν ἡ τῶν σωμάτων ἰατροί, ἐστράφη τοῦ ἐν χερσὶ δεικνύμενα. De Pœnit. in Luc. vii. 36. &c. T. ii. p. 165. D.

^p Σαφιστοὶ δὲ τοῖς ἐφεσίοις. Orat. in 1 Cor. xv. 28. T. ii. p. 15. C. Vid. et Catechet.

Or. cap. 32. T. iii. p. 94. A. In Chr. Ref. Or. i. T. 3. p. 396. C. et alibi.

7. He

7. He often expressly quotes the epistle to the Hebrews; and as ^a Paul's.

8. Gregory seldom quotes the book of the Revelation: yea, I think he sometimes declines to quote it, when there are fair occasions for so doing: however, he ^r has expressly quoted it in one of his orations; and though he there calls it apocryphal, perhaps he needs not be supposed to intend to detract from it, for he calls it the evangelist John's.

9. There is a passage ^s in Gregory's book against Apollinarius, published by Laurence Zacagni, where it may be questioned, whether Gregory refers to Rev. i. 8. or ^t John viii. 25. according to a very uncommon reading indeed, but which seems to be that followed by the author of the Gothic version. For clearing this I put below ^u a part of the note of the learned Latin translator upon the place.

10. Titles and divisions, and marks of respect for the scriptures, are such as these: the ^x sacred writers of the gospels; the ^y divine gospels; apostles ^z and prophets; one ^a and the same God speaks in the prophets, and in the New Testament; Paul ^b the herald or preacher of grace, the chief conductor of the church's marriage, and the mouth of Christ. I refer to ^c another place very honourable to that apostle. He says, it ^d is one of the Lord's commands, that we should study the scriptures. See John v. 39. He reckons it to the advantage of Ephrem the Syrian, that ^e from early age he had been instructed in the sacred scriptures. I omit many other like things, not needful to be transcribed. He proves ^f what he advances

^a Διο και Παυλος Εβραιους επιτελλων διδου. In Chr. Ref. Or. ii. T. iii. p. 408. B. et passim.

^r Ηκησα τε ευαγγελιστην Ιωαννη εν αποκρυφους προς της τοιυτης ε' αιουμαλως λεγοντος — Ωφελον γαρ ησθα, φησι ψυχρος, η ζεσος. In suam ordinat. T. ii. p. 44. A.

^s — καθως φησι πε της γραφης ο λοφος· οτι εγω ειμι η αρχη. Adv. Apoll. cap. 37. p. 219. Zacagn. Monum. Vet.

^t Ideo dixerunt ei: Tu quis es? Et dixit eis Jesus: Principium, seu quomodo dico vobis. Sac. Evang. Verf. Goth. cum Interpret. Lat. Eric. Benzel. Oxon. 1750.

^u Principium.] Legit ergo, quamvis nullo qui nunc superest codice mss. consentiente, η αρχη, οτι και λεω τιμω. Nam religiosus interpres, si casum quantum invenisset, utique scripsisset. — Benzel. in loc.

^x Οι των ευαγγελιστων αλλη συγγραφεις. In Chr. Ref. Or. ii. T. iii. p. 400. D.

^y Encom. Ephr. Syr. T. iii. p. 595. B.

^z Η των αποστολων

τε και προφητων διδασκαλων. De Occurs. Dom. T. iii. p. 446. D.

Δια τωλο ηλθοι αι των προφητων και αποστολων σαλπιγες. In Natal. Chr. T. iii. p. 340. A.

^a Δεικνυσι — ινα και τον αυτον θεον τε και νομοθετη εν τε προφηταις και τη καινη διαθηκη λελαληκται. De Oc. Dom. T. iii. p. 460. B.

^b Ο εζηλω της χαριτος, ο νυμφος της εκκλησιας, το τη Χριστω γεμα. Vit. S. Ephr. T. iii. p. 596. C.

^c In 1 Cor. xv. 28. T. ii. p. 6. B.

^d Και τωλο των δισπλικων παραγγελματων εστι, το δειν ιρευναι τας γραφας. In Ecclef. hom. i. T. i. p. 374. C.

^e Ο τραφεις μεν εκ πρωτης ηλικιας, και αυξηθεις εν τη των θειων μελετη γραφων, ποτισθεις δε τοις της χαριτος αιμασις ονυσις. κ. λ. De Vit. S. Ephr. T. iii. p. 598. C.

^f Και μυριας εστι περι τωτης της αλίας γραφης παραδοθει. Φωιας. In Hexaem. T. i. 14. D. Conf. ib. p. 28. D.

by texts of scripture. Again, 'Where^e did Apollinarius learn, that the Spirit became incarnate? What scripture says this? We have not learned any such thing from the gospels: but that the Word became flesh, as the great apostle says.'

III. I shall now take some select passages, partly relating to the scriptures, partly to other matters.

1. There^a are five orations of Gregory upon the Lord's prayer, but no notice taken of any doxology at the end.

2. Gregory says, thatⁱ in the most exact copies, St. Mark's gospel concluded with those words ch. xvi. 8. *For they were afraid.* But in some copies it was added, *Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene*; and what follows: In which, he says, there seemed to be some things different from the accounts given of our Lord's resurrection by the other evangelists. He therefore reconciles them, and compares together all the four evangelists, Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark. Which shews, there were no other authentic histories of Christ, except these four; and that there were no other, for which the church had any regard.

Mill says, that^k Gregory Nyssen is the first, who has taken any notice of this various reading at the conclusion of St. Mark's gospel.

3. He says, there^l are three Maries mentioned as standing at the foot of the cross of Jesus, Mary our Lord's mother, Mary wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. John xix. 25. For Mary mother of James, or mother of James and Josès, as mentioned by the other evangelists, he cannot but think to be the same with our Lord's mother; James and Josès he supposes to be children of Joseph, whom he had by a former marriage. He moreover says, that^m James called *the less* in Mark xv. 40. was not an apostle, being different from James the son of Alpheus, who was one of the twelve apostles.

4. 'Thatⁿ we might be satisfied Christ had a real body, and was not a man in appearance, the scriptures have recorded without reserve every thing peculiar to our nature, his eating, and drinking, and sleeping, weariness, refresh-

^e Τίς γραφή ταῦτα λέγει. — Οὐχ ἕως παρα τῶν εὐαγγελίων κηρύσσει. Οὐχ ἕως παρα τῆς μετὰ τὴν ἀποστολὴν φωνῆς ἐδιδάχθημεν· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν οὐ λόγος σαφὲς εἰσέτι. κ. λ. Adv. Apoll. cap. 12. ubi sup. p. 148.

^h T. i. p. 712—761. ⁱ Εἰ μὲν τοῖς ἀκριβετέροις ἀντιγραφαῖς τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον, μέχρι τῆς φοβῆντο γὰρ, ἔχει τὸ τέλος. Εἰ δὲ τίσις προκίβηται καὶ ταῦτα, κ. λ.

In Chr. Ref. Or. ii. T. iii. p. 411. B.

^k E codicibus istius ævi memorat primus jam (quod sciam) Gregorius Nyssenus nonnullos, in quibus Evangelium Marci finitum erat ad capitulum xvi. ver. 8. verba ista, ἐφ' ὧν γὰρ. Prolegom. n. 812.

^l Vid. ibid. p. 412. C. D. 413. A.

^m Ib. p. 413. B. C.

ⁿ Ep. ad Eustath. &c. T. iii. p. 658. C. D.

'ment by food, growing in bodily stature, and in wisdom.
'But he had no sickness, nor decays, as he had no sin.'

5. He^e speaks of the advantage, which redounds to us from Thomas's slowness to believe: we have thereby fuller assurance, he says, that Christ rose with the same body that had died.

6. Gregory^s observes some things in St. John's gospel, as proofs of the reality of our Lord's resurrection, and that the body was not stolen out of the sepulchre. 'Says John, *Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes*, ch. xix. 40. Which linen clothes were not taken away, but *were seen lying* by John and Peter, ch. xx. 5, 6. But how should thieves have had time to pull off the linen bandages [or wrappers], which being spicy would cling to the body, and could not be pulled off but in some time, by persons who had leisure? Moreover, says¹ he, how should thieves have leisure and assurance, to put *the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself*, ver. 7. Here are no signs of the horror or hurry of thieves.' Perhaps such observations as these may satisfy some people, that the ancient Christians had a small share of good sense.

7. There is a letter of Gregory to a friend concerning those who go to Jerusalem, or other places near it. 'Some' there are,' he says, 'who think it a branch of piety to go to Jerusalem, to see the places which the Lord had honoured with his presence, when in the body. But^s here, first, it may be well to look to the rule: and if the Lord has not commanded it, nor among the beatitudes pronounced them blessed that go to Jerusalem, it may be let alone. He mentions divers inconveniencies of this journey, and the temptations to which people are exposed therein. Besides, Christ is not now at Jerusalem: nor is there any reason to think the fullness of the Spirit so confined to Jerusalem, but that it may reach us at home. Moreover,' he says, 'that Jerusalem was then a very wicked place; and that there were better helps for piety in Cappadocia.' They who please may compare Gregory with Jerom, who seems little better affected to these pilgrimages, than our author.

¹ Καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐκείνου πολυπραΐμοτος τοιαύτην ἀδίαν, ὡς καὶ τοῦ κεφαλῆς χαλῶμα κατὰ τάξιν εἶλιν καὶ τιθεῖται χωρὶς; Ibid. 405. C. D. T. iii. p. 651—658.
ἐπιθυμίας καὶ ἐπαφῆς, ἡμεῖς εἰς τὴν πίσιν ἰδὲταισθαι, ἐν ᾧ σωματι πεποιθεν, ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκφέρειναι περιουτίας τοῦ ἡμανελλ. x. λ. Ibid. p. 204. C. p. Ib. p. 405. βλεπεῖν. p. 652. A. Ad Paulin.
² Πῶς γὰρ σκέλην εἶχον οἱ κλεῖται καὶ τρ. 49. al. 13. T. iv. p. 564.

8. He ^u intirely disclaims the expectation of a voluptuous Millennium, the renewal of Jewish sacrifices, and a terrestrial Jerusalem adorned with precious stones.

9. There ^x are in Gregory several passages, asserting free-will in strong terms; to which I refer.

C H A P. CI.

DIDYMUS OF ALEXANDRIA.

- I. *His history, and character, his commentaries upon the scriptures, and other works.* II. *His testimony to the scriptures farther shewn.* III. *Select passages.*

I. 1. DIDYMUS, master ^a of the catechetical school at Alexandria, flourished ^b about the year 370. He ^c lost his sight by a distemper, when very young, in the fourth or fifth year of his age, before he had learned to read, or whilst he was learning letters. He attained nevertheless to great learning; beside grammar and rhetoric, he understood logic, music, geometry, astronomy, the most abstruse problems of the mathematicians, and all the opinions of the philosophers; as we are assured by divers ancient ecclesiastical writers, who cannot forbear to call him a wonderful man. They also say, that ^d he had great acquaintance with the divine oracles of the Old and New Testament, so as to write many commentaries upon them. As Sozomen says: ‘Many, ^e excited by his great fame, came from ^f far to Alexandria, some to hear him, others only to see him.

^u Ad Eust. et Ambr. T. iii. p. 658. C. D.

^x De Hominis Opificio. cap. iv. T. 1. p. 526. E. De Vita Moïsis. p. 200. C. D. 203. A. B. De Anima. T. ii. p. 107. B. Catechet. Or. cap. 31. T. iii. p. 91. et cap. 39. p. 105.

^a ——— προισταμενος εν Αλεξανδρεια τη ιερη διδασκαλεια των ιερων μαθηματων. Soz. l. iii. c. 15. in.

^b Vid. Cav. H. L.

^c Didymus Alexandrinus multa de nostro dogmate per notarios commentatur: qui post quintum navitatis annum luminibus orbatus, elementorum quoque ignarus fuit. Hieron. Chr. ad A. 372. p. 187. Et vid. infr. not. 1.

^d Is namque in parva ætate, cum adhuc etiam prima literarum ignoraret elementa,

luminibus orbatus. Ruf. H. E. l. ii. c. 7.

Ουλος κομιδη νος ων, και τα πρωτα των γραμματων φοιχεια μαθων. Socr. l. iv. c. 25.

— τυφλος γενεο εν τη πρωτη ωνιρα της μαθησεως των φοιτειων. Soz. l. iii. c. 15.

— ως αυτος μοι διηγησατο, τετραεις τας οφεις αποβαλων, υπη γραμματων μαθητης. Pallad. Hist. Lauf. cap. 3. Ap. Bib. PP. Morell. T. xiii. p. 904.

^d Ον μην αλλα και τα θεια λογια παλαιας και καινης διαθηκης εως ακριβως εμακει, ως πολλοι μεν εκδιναι βιβλια. Socr. l. iv. c. 25. p. 241. ^e Ην δε η τυτυχος θανμα και πολλοι κατὰ το κλος τη αιδρος εις Αλεξανδρεια παρεινιστο, οι μεν αυτις ακησομενοι, οι δε ιεροσολις μοιου. κ. λ. Soz. l. iii. c. 15. p. 523. C.

‘ And

‘And it was no small grief to the Arians, that he maintained the Nicene doctrine.’ He adds, ‘that he persuaded men not so much by the force of his reasons, as by the agreeable manner of proposing them: for he would make every one to be judge of the point in question.’ Some account of the character of Didymus was given ‘formerly, when the amiable mildness of his temper, here intimated by Sozomen, was collected from the moderation conspicuous in his writings against the Manichees.

2. In the * preface to his own Commentaries upon Hosea, Jerom styles Didymus the most learned man of his time. Palladius ^b says, he surpassed all the ancients in knowledge.

3. Jerom often expresses * great affection and esteem for Didymus. And though, when the controversy about Origen’s orthodoxy was on foot, he takes notice of his acceding to the peculiar opinions of that eminent ancient, he always † allows him to have maintained the catholic doctrine concerning the Trinity; and acknowledges his prodigious memory, great learning, and fine manner of writing.

4. Jerom, who has placed Didymus in his Catalogue of Illustrious Men, there says, that ¹ he wrote commentaries upon

^f Vol. iii. p. 389.

^g — quum essem Alexandriae, vidi Didymum, et eum frequenter audiui, virum sui temporis eruditissimum. Rogavi eum, ut quod Origenes non fecerat, ipse compleret, et scriberet in Osce Commentarios. Qui tres libros, me petente, dictavit, quinque quoque alios in Zachariam. Pr. in Osce. T. iii. p. 1238.

^h — ως παλαιὰς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἐν γλώσσῃ. Hist. Lauf. cap. iii. ubi supra. * Prætermitto Didymum videntem meum. Pr. in ep. ad Gal. T. iv. P. i. p. 222.

Et Didymus, cujus amicitia nuper usi sumus. Prol. in Il. T. iii. p. 6.

Jam canis spargebatur caput, et magistrum potius quam discipulum decebat. Perrexi tamen Alexandriam, audiui Didymum. In multis ei gratias ago. Quod nescivi didici: quod sciebam, illo docente, non perdidici. Ad Pamm. et Ocean. ep. 41. al. 65. T. iv. p. 342.

† In Didymo vero et memoriam prædicamus, et super Trinitate fidei puritatem: sed in cæteris, quæ Origeni male credidit, nos ab eo retrahimus. Adv. Ruf. l. iii. p. 463. f. T. iv. Conf. adv. Ruf. l. i. p. 335. M.

Quid respondebis pro Didymo, qui certe in Trinitate Catholicus est? Cujus etiam

nos de Spiritu Sancto librum in Latinam linguam vertimus. — Cæterum in aliis dogmatibus et Eusebius et Didymus apertissime in Origenis seita concedunt: et quod omnes ecclesiæ reprobant catholice et pie dictum esse defendunt. Adv. Ruf. l. i. p. 407. 409.

Quis prudentior, doctior, eloquentior Eusebio et Didymo, assertoribus Origenis, inveniri potest? Ad Pamm. et Ocean. Ep. 41. al. 65. T. iv. p. 347. in.

¹ Didymus Alexandrinus, captus a parva ætate oculis, et ob id elementorum ignarus, tantum miraculum sui omnibus præbuit, ut Dialecticam quoque et Geometriam, quæ vel maxime visu indiget, usque ad perfectum didicerit. Hic plura nobilique opera conscripsit: Commentarios in Evangelium Matthæi et Johannis: et de dogmatibus, et contra Arianos libros duos: et de Spiritu Sancto librum unum, quem ego in Latinum verti: in Isaiam tomos decem et octo: in Osce ad me scribens Commentariorum libros tres: et in Zachariam, meo rogatu, libros quinque: et Commentarios in Job: multaque alia, quæ digerere proprii indicis est. Vivit usque hodie, et octogesimum tertium ætatis excessit annum. De V. l. cap. 109.

the whole book of Psalms, and upon the gospels of Matthew and John; a treatise of the Holy Spirit, translated into Latin by Jerom; also commentaries upon Isaiah, Hosea, Zechariah, Job; against the Arians, in three books; and many other works. When Jerom wrote his book of Illustrious Men, in 392, Didymus was living, being then in the 84th year of his age. He died a short time afterwards.

5. The ^m commentaries upon Hosea and Zechariah were written at Jerom's request. Many of Jerom's passages, where he speaks distinctly of Didymus's commentaries upon the scriptures, are transcribed at length at the bottom of the pages of the chapter of Apollinarius; where they may be read by those who are curious.

6. Beside the commentaries mentioned by Jerom, Didymus wrote also enarrations, or short notes upon the seven catholic epistles, of which we saw good proof some while ⁿ ago.

7. They who are desirous to know more of his commentaries upon the scriptures, may consult ^o Fabricius and ^p Tillmont.

8. We still have a book of Didymus ^q against the Manichees, in the original Greek, of which some notice was taken in the history of that ^r sect; the ^s treatise of the Holy Spirit, in Jerom's version; and ^t the Enarrations upon the seven catholic epistles in Latin. And in the Greek Chains are fragments of some of his commentaries. The late excellent Mr. J. C. Wolff, of Hamburgh, published ^u a large collection of notes and observations of Didymus upon the Acts of the apostles, taken from a manuscript Greek Chain, at the University of Oxford.

II. In these three works still remaining, Against the Manichees, Of the Holy Spirit, and the Enarrations upon the catholic epistles, many of the books of the New Testament are frequently quoted.

1. The ^v epistle to the Ephesians is quoted with that title.

2. Didymus received the epistle to the Hebrews, as Paul's. It is quoted in all the three works just mentioned; in ^w the

^m See note 2.

ⁿ See Vol. ii. p. 228.

^o Bib. Gr.

T. viii. p. 353-357.

^p Mem. Ec.

T. x.

^q Apud Combefis. Auctar.

Noviss. P. ii. p. 21. &c. et ap. Canis.

Lecton. ex edit. Bafnag. p. 204. &c.

^r See Vol. iii. p. 389.

^s Ap. S.

Hierona. Opp. T. iv. P. i. p. 494. &c.

^t Ap. Bib. PP. Lugdun. T. iv. p. 319.

&c.

^u Vid. Wolff. Anecd. Græc.

T. iv. p. 1-52. Hamb. 1724.

^w Beatus quoque Apostolus ad Ephesios

scribens ait. De Sp. S. ap. Hieron. T. i.

p. 497. in.

^x Paulus in epistola,

quam ad Hebræos scribit. De Sp. S. p.

495. Vid. et p. 502. et passim.

tract concerning the Holy Spirit, against ⁷ the Manichees, and the ² Enarrations.

3. He supposeth, the ¹ first epistle of Peter to be written to Jews scattered abroad in several countries.

4. At the end of his Enarration upon the second epistle of Peter he either says, that ^b it is spurious, or that it has been corrupted and interpolated, and therefore is not in the canon. Nevertheless, I think, it must generally have been in authority with the Christians among whom Didymus lived, that is, at Alexandria; otherwise he would not have written notes upon it, together with the other catholic epistles. However, this passage, if rightly represented in the Latin version, may be allowed to be an intimation, that there were some, who had doubts about its genuineness and authority.

5. I suppose, that the book of the Revelation was received by Didymus; it ^c is quoted in the Enarrations.

6. He manifests his respect for the scriptures, calling them the ^d divine scriptures, and continually proving what he asserts from ^e the books of the Old and New Testament, and ^f the writings of the apostles and prophets, in both which speaks the same Spirit.

III. Shall I now add a few select passages, before I conclude this chapter?

1. Eph. ii. 3. *And were by nature children of wrath, as well as others.* Didymus says, the ^g meaning of *by nature* is really, truly, indeed; for all sinners are obnoxious to wrath. *We were once truly, really, children of wrath, as well as others*; that is, as they who are still in sin.

2. He ^h rejected the common notion of the Millennium, embraced by many at that time.

^γ Ως γράφει Παυλος τοις πειροις: Τιμιος ε γαρ κ. λ. Contr. Manich. ap. Combef. p. 26. in.

^z Vid. Enarr. in 1 Joan. cap. iv. ap. B. P. P. T. iv. p. 333. B.

^a Positus Petrus circumcisionis Apostolus, omniumque Judæorum habens studium, scribit eis qui in totius orbis dispersione morabantur, tanquam advenis civitatum extranearum. In 1 ep. Pet. c. i. in. p. 321. E. Vid. et Enarr. in ep. Jacob. p. 300. A.

^b Non est igitur ignorandum, præsentem epistolam esse falsatam. Quæ licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est. Enarr. in 2 Pet. iii. ap. B. P. P. T. iv. p. 326. G.

^c —cujus sit memoria in Apocalypsi per Jezebel. Enarr. in ep. Jud. p. 336. D.

^d Αι θειαι γραφαι. Contr. Manich. p. 22. m.

Plena sunt volumina divinarum scriptu-

rarum his sermonibus. De Sp. S. p. 495. in.

^e Veteris quoque Testamenti homo David.—Necnon etiam in Novo Testamento. Ibid.

^f Possumus quidem testimonia de divinis literis exhibere, quia idem Spiritus et Apostolis et Prophetis fuit. Ibid. et passim.

^g Οτι ημεν φουσι τακα ορσις, ως και οι λοιποι ανθρωποι: οι ειστις διουρο εν τη αμαρτανι ολεις. Προσκειμενον δε το φουσι η το καλα φουσι σημαίνει, αλλα το αληθεια—δηλον, οτι αληθεια υπευθυνοι ορση υπαρχουσιν οι αμαρτανολεις. Contr. Manich. p. 23. A. Ed. Combef.

^h Si ergo in cælis fidelibus hæc servatur hæreditas, frivola quædam et tepida prosperunt aliqui putantes, eam se percipere in terrena Jerusalem. &c. Enarr. in 1 ep. Pet. cap. i. ver. 4. p. 321. G. H.

3. Didymus asserts the personality of the Holy Spirit: and yet he supposeth, thatⁱ thereby is meant in many texts of scripture a gift, or a fulness of divine gifts.

C H A P. CII.

EPHREM THE SYRIAN.

I. *His time and character.* II. *The editions of his works.* III. *A farther account of his works, for shewing what books of the Old and New Testament were received by him.* IV. *General titles and divisions.* V. *Marks of respect for the scriptures.* VI. *Select passages.*

I. EPHREM, or EPHRAÏM, called the Syrian, was born at Nisibis, or near it, in Mesopotamia. But he spent the larger and latter part of his time at Edeffa. He lived for a while a monastic kind of life; afterwards he was made deacon, which was the highest ecclesiastical order to which he attained.

According to Cave, Ephrem flourished about the year 370, and died in 378. I place him likewise at 370, though I think, he must have been an author much sooner. Dr. Asseman supposeth, that^a he was a disciple of James bishop of Nisibis, and that he accompanied him to the council of Nice in 325. The time of his birth is not known with certainty; though Asseman says, upon the authority of Syrian writers, that^b he was born under the reign of Constantine; and he thinks, he died before^c the end of the year 378. Which is agreeable to Jerom's account, who says, that Ephrem died in the time of the emperor Valens. Fabricius thinks, he died in 375. Basnage, not before 380.

ⁱ Nam eundem Evangelii locum Matthæus Lucasque describens, alter ex his ait: *Quanto magis Pater celestis dabit bona petentibus se?* [Matt. vii. 11.] Alter vero: *Quanto magis Pater vester celestis dabit Spiritum Sanctum petentibus se?* [Luc. xi. 13.] Ex quibus apparet, Spiritum Sanctum plenitudinem esse donorum Dei. De Sp. S. p. 496. in.

Dicimus autem virtutis et disciplinæ quosdam esse plenos: ut illud: *Repletus est Spiritu Sancto.* Ex. xxxi. 3. non aliud significantes quam plenos esse consummatæ atque perfectæ virtutis. Ib. p. 498. m.

Quia nunc proposuimus ostendere, super-

intelligi semper in Spiritu Sancto dona virtutum: ita ut qui eum habet, donationibus Dei plenus habeatur. Unde et in Isaia.—*Ponam Spiritum meum super semen tuum, et benedictiones meas super filios tuos.* Ib. p. 500. infr. in.

^a Jacobus, cognomento Magnus, natus Nisibi—ad episcopatum Nisibis electus fuit, ubi sanctum Ephræm auditorem habuit. Anno Alexandri 636, Christii 325, una cum Ephræmo in Bithyniam profectus, Concilio Nicæno interfuit, doctrinæ orthodoxæ vindex acerrimus. Jos. Assem. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 17. in.

^b Ib. p. 24.

^c Ib. p. 54. not. 1.

For

For a more particular account of Ephrem, I refer to the learned moderns already named, ^d Cave, ^e Basnage, ^f Fabricius, ^g Asseman, and likewise to ^h Tillemont. As Jerom has an article for him, I put it ⁱ in the margin. He mentions a book of Ephrem, translated into Greek, which is not now known to be extant.

Ephrem was a man of great fame, and much esteemed among the Greeks, as well as Syrians. Sozomen ^k has a particular account of him, and gives him high commendations. Theodoret speaks of him ^l more than once: he says, he ^m was an excellent man, and a fine writer; though he was not acquainted with the Greek learning. In Photius ⁿ is an account of several of Ephrem's works, which he had read in Greek. There is an Encomium, or Life of Ephrem, written by ^o Gregory Nyssen, if it be his; for it is ^p doubted of: however, if it is not Gregory's, it was, probably, written by some other not long after his time. That author calls ^q Ephrem the doctor of the whole world: and it is common with the Syrian writers, to ^r call him the doctor or master of the world, and their prophet.

II. There have been for some time two editions of Ephrem's works; one by Gerard Vossius, in Latin, in three volumes, at Rome, finished in 1597, and since published elsewhere; another in Greek, at Oxford, in 1709. Of both these editions accounts may be seen in the fore-mentioned writers, particularly ^s J. A. Fabricius, and ^t Dr. Joseph Asseman, who after having thrown a great deal of new light upon the history and works of Ephrem, in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, has at length, together with other assistants, published at Rome a much more complete edition of his works, in six tomes or volumes; three

^d Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 235. &c.

^e Basnag. Ann. 375. n. vi. 380. n. x.

^f Bib. Gr. L. v. c. 2. T. v. p. 319. &c.

^g Bib. Orient. cap. vi. p. 24. &c.

^h Mem. Ecc. T. viii.

ⁱ Ephrem, Edessenæ ecclesiæ Diaconus, multa Syro sermone composuit, et ad tantam venit claritudinem, ut post lectionem Scripturarum publice in quibusdam ecclesiis ejus scripta recitentur. Legi ejus de Spiritu Sancto Græcū volumen, quod quidam de Syriaca lingua verterat, et acumen sublimis ingenii etiam translatione agnovi. Decessit sub Valente Principe. De V. I. cap. 115.

^k Soz. H. E. l. iii. c. 16.

^l Theod. H. E. l. ii. c. 30. l. iv. c. 29.

^m L. ii. c. 30. p. 118. D.

ⁿ Cod. 196. p. 512. &c.

^o Greg:

Nyff. T. iii. p. 597. &c.

^p See Tillemont. S. Ephræm. Art. i. note 1.

^q Ο ημῖνος, μάλλον δὲ τῆς οἰκουμένης διδασκαλὸς Εφραίμ. Gr. N. ib. p. 601.

^r Ephræm Syrus tantum apud suos sanctimonie et doctrine famam adeptus est, ut orbis Doctor, et Prophetæ Syrorum ab ipsis passim appelletur. Assem. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 24.

Ephræm magnus, qui appellatus est Syrorum Prophetæ. Ebedjes. ap. Assem. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 61.

^s Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 321—331.

^t Vid. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 60. et p. 159

—163. et Prolegom. ad Ephr. opp. T. i.

Gr. et Lat.

^u Tom. i. cap. vi. p. 24. &c.

^v Tom. i. cap. vi. p.

of which are Syriac and Latin, and the other three Greek and Latin. This edition was begun to be published in 1732, and finished in 1747.

I believe, I shall scarce quote at all the edition of Vossius, which is a translation of a translation. Nor can one quote the Greek with full assurance, which consists of translations, made we know not when, nor by whom.

Cave says, there ^a is reason to suspect the genuineness of many works in the collection of Vossius. Tillemont ^b speaks to the like purpose. A work, called the ^c Confession, is very doubtful: Tillemont defends it; but he is sensible, that it ^d was not known to Gregory Nyssen, or whoever was the author of the above-mentioned Encomium. And speaking of a story therein related, he has these expressions: 'These,' says ^e he, 'are indeed extraordinary circumstances; but we see no good reason to doubt of their truth, the Confession having in it too many marks of sincerity, and also of grandeur, to allow us to imagine it to be one of the pretended pious romances, too common among the Greeks.' Dr. Asselman likewise has taken notice of a difficulty, relating ^f to this Confession, which I cannot say he has answered.

The famous piece, called Ephrem's Testament, as published in Greek at Oxford, and in Latin by Vossius, is interpolated, as Asselman expressly ^g says. There are also very considerable differences between the ^h Greek and Syriac copies, published in the late edition at Rome. And the same learned Dr. Asselman supposes, that there are interpolations in the ⁱ Greek, and another large interpolation in ^j the Syriac copy of the same

^a Quin et non immerito forsan censeri potest plurima in editione Vossiana opuscula Ephraemum auctorem non habere: quot vero, aut quamam ea sint, ob rationes supra allatas haud ita facile est judicare. Cav. ib. p. 238.

^b Il est difficile de douter, qu'il n'y ait dans cette édition plusieurs pièces, qui ne sont pas du grand. S. Ephrem. Ibid. art. 28, sub fin.

^c Εὐαγγέλιον αὐτῆς καὶ ἐξομολογήσεις. Εν πολλοῖς ἔμει, ἀδελφοί, δοκῶν χρησιμεῖν. κ. λ. Oxon. ΠΣ. seu p. 82. et T. i. Gr. et Lat. p. 119. &c. Romæ.

^d S. Ephrem. note (4).

^e S. Ephrem. art. v.

^f Vid. Bib.

^g Prodiit autem

^h Latine per Vossium, et Græce in nupera

ⁱ editione Oxoniensi. Utraque tamen versio

^j mendis scatet, quæ ex nostro Syriaco textu

^k corrigi possunt. Asselman. Bib. Or. T. i.

p. 141: ^a Vid. Testamentum Græce p. 230. &c. Syriace p. 395. &c. Apud Ephr. Opp. T. ii. Gr. et Lat.

^b Præterea multa Græcus Interpres de suo adjecit, quæ in textu desiderantur, ut historiam hominis ab immundo spiritu correpti, quem Ephraem morti proximus curasse dicitur. pag. 293. a lin. 2. usque ad lin. 13. [vid. p. 236. B. C. D. T. ii. Gr. Romæ.] Et historiam Abgari Edessæ Regis, qui urbem illam extruxisse perperam narratur pag. 297. a lin. 42. usque ad lin. 50. [vid. p. 235. F. 236. A. T. ii. Gr.] Asselman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 141.

^c Contra, quædam Syriace habentur, quæ in Græca versione non extant, ut digressio de Moyse et magis. &c. Asselman. ib. p. 141, 142. Conf. Testam. Syriace, apud T. ii. Gr. et Lat. p. 405—408.

work, even as now published in the new edition at Rome. And may I not be allowed to say, that the whole Testament has an air of fiction? For it is not likely, that a man who was just expiring, should be able to make so long a discourse in the presence of a great number of people.

And there ^h are divers things in Syriac ascribed to Ephrem, which are not his. However, undoubtedly, there are also many works remaining, which may be relied upon as genuine.

III. Having given this account of the editions of Ephrem, and made some general remarks upon his works, I proceed in a farther account of them, chiefly with a view of observing his testimony to the scriptures.

1. The Latin of Vossius, and the Greek at Oxford, have no commentaries upon the scriptures. Those editions contain only homilies, exhortations and meditations, and such like things, written in a popular and pathetic manner: but the late edition at Rome, beside those things, affords many of Ephrem's commentaries upon the Old Testament. The first volume, Syriac and Latin, contains Ephrem's commentaries upon the five books of Moses, and upon Joshua, the Judges, the two books of Samuel, and the two books of the Kings: and in the second volume of the Syriac works, with a Latin translation, are commentaries upon Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Zechariah, and Malachi.

2. Ebedjesu, in his catalogue, enumerates ⁱ Ephrem's commentaries upon most, or all the books of the Old Testament, particularly upon Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve prophets. He says nothing of any commentaries of Ephrem upon any book of the Old Testament after those; which makes me think, that Ephrem's canon of the Old Testament was the same with that of the Jews. Moreover, in his Syriac works still remaining, he has several times expressly called ^k Malachi the last of the prophets. And Asseman owns, that ^l in his commentary upon the book of Daniel, Ephrem

^h Primus [sermo] de Virginis Annuntiatione inscribitur. In quo, Sancti Ephraemi præter nomen et metrum omnia desideres, iudicium, ingenium, eruditionem, stilum. Assen. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 139. fin.

ⁱ Apud Assen. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 61, 62. Vid. et T. i. p. 58.

^k Judæorum sacrificia Prophetæ declarant immunda fuisse. Quæ ergo Esaias hoc loco hominum canumve cadaveribus æquiparat, Malachias, Prophetarum ultimus,

animalium retrimenta vocat, non offerenda Deo, sed offerentium in ora cum obprobatione rejicienda [Malach. ii. 3.] Comment. in Es. lxi. 3. T. ii. Syr. p. 94. C. D.

Malachias, omnium Prophetarum postremus, populo commendat legem, et legis coronidem Joannem, quem Eliam cognominat. Comm. in Malach. iv. 4. Ib. p. 315. C.

^l Quæ D. Hieronymus ex Theodotione transtulit Danielis capita, nimirum Cant-

takes no notice of the Song of the three Children, or of the stories of Susanna, or Bell and the Dragon. I may add here, that though Ephrem commented upon the book of Jeremiah's Lamentations, there appears not any commentary of his upon Baruch.

3. Dr. Asseman says, that ^m in his Testament, Ephrem quotes the second book of the Maccabees, as canonical scripture. But that does not appear clear to me: he might quote the books of Maccabees, and of Ecclesiasticus, and Wisdom, as many other of the ancient Christians did, without esteeming them canonical. We saw just now, that Ephrem esteemed Malachi the last of the prophets; therefore he admitted no later writings into the canon of the Old Testament. A division of scripture, frequent in Ephrem, and to be taken notice of by and by, confirms what is here said.

4. Before I proceed, I should observe, that Ephrem received the book of Canticles; it is quoted ⁿ in his Syriac commentaries. He also plainly refers to ^o the book of Ruth.

5. Ebedjesu does not mention any commentaries of Ephrem upon the books of the New Testament. Gregory Nyssen indeed says, that ^p Ephrem not only meditated upon the scriptures, but also particularly explained every part of the Old and New Testament from Genesis to the last book of grace. But that may be in part an oratorical flight, from which some abatements should be made. It is, I think, observable, that Ebedjesu says nothing of any commentaries of Ephrem upon the New Testament. His silence must be reckoned an argument, that there were none upon the New Testament, or that they were not so well known, as those upon the Old. However, we are assured by Dr. Asseman, in part quoted ^q formerly, that ^r Dionysius Barsalibæus, and Gregory Barhebræus, in their

cum trium puerorum, cap. 3. a ver. 24. ad ver. 91. Historiam Susannæ cap. 13. Bel idoli, et Draconis, atque in lacum leonis missi cap. 14. ea S. Ephræm, Hebræorum textum sequutus, in hisce commentariis tacitus præteriiit. Hæc enim in Vulgata Syrorum Versione haud extabant: licet postea ex Græcis exemplaribus in Syriacum a recentioribus interpretibus conversa fuerint. &c. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 71.

^m Vid. ib. p. 144. ⁿ — quorum meminit etiam sapientissimus Salomon in Canticis Canticorum: Ecce, inquit, lectulum Salomonis sexaginta fortes ambulant: [Cant. iii. 7.] In Exod. cap. xxxvii. T. i. Syr. p. 229. F.

Christus enim est Rex Regum et verus

David, id est, dilectus et amabilis—quem laudat Ecclesia, gloriosa sponsa, in suis Canticis, dicens: *Dilectus meus candidus et rubicundus.* [Cant. v. 10.] In 1 Sam. xvi. 13. T. i. Syr. p. 365. E.

Vid. et in Mich. Pr. T. ii. Syr. p. 272. B. et Paræn. 14. T. iii. Syr. p. 436. F.

^o In Natal. Domini. Serm. 7. T. ii.

Syr. p. 421, 422. ^p Πασαν γὰρ παλαιαν τε καὶ καινὴν ἐκμείλησας γραφὴν—

ὅλην ἀκριβῶς πρὸς λιγὴν ἠρμηνεύσει ἀπο τε τῆς κοσμογονίας, καὶ μέχρι τῆς τελειότητος τῆς χάριτος βίβλου. κ. λ. De Vit. Ephr. T. iii. p. 601. D.

^q See Vol. ii. p. 419. ^r Dionysius Barsalibæus et Jacobitarum scita, Amidæ in Mesopotamia

Episcopus in suis Commentariis in Evangelio com-

commentaries upon the gospels quote the commentaries of Ephrem upon the same gospels. And it may be very proper for my readers to recollect here what was †† formerly said of Ephrem's writing commentaries upon Tatian's Harmony of the four gospels; but still I see no particular mention of commentaries of Ephrem upon any other books of the New Testament. And when Dr. Asseman published the first volume of his Oriental Library at Rome, in 1719, he^a had not discovered any copies of the above-named commentaries upon the gospels; though he speaks of some fragments^c of commentaries upon the gospels. Nor are there in the late edition of Ephrem's works at Rome, any commentaries upon any books of the New Testament.

6. Whether Ephrem wrote commentaries upon the scriptures of the New Testament, or not, he certainly received all those books, which had been all along generally received by Christians as sacred scripture. This appears from his works published formerly in Latin and Greek, and from the Syriac works lately published at Rome: in all which are quoted the four gospels and the Acts very frequently, and St. Paul's epistles, and the first epistle of St. Peter, and the first of St. John.

7. To be a little more particular, so far as is needful. He expressly speaks in his Syriac works of^a the four holy evangelists, and^b the doctrine of the gospel, the word of life, written by the four evangelists, and^c of the sacred volume of the gospels.

gelia Codice Syriaco Vaticano xli.—sæpe laudat Ephræmi Commentaria in Textum Evangeliorum, de quibus in Præfatione ad Marcum sic loquitur. ^a Tatianus, Iuliani ^b Philosophi et Martyris discipulus, ex ^c Quatuor Evangeliiis unum digessit, quod ^d Diatessaron nuncupavit. Hunc librum ^e Sanctus Ephræm commentariis illustravit. Et infra: ^f Sanctus quoque Ephræm, ordinem Diatessari sequutus, Evangelium ^g explanavit. Idem testatur Barhebræus, vulgo Abulpharagius, Episcopus Tagritensis, in libro, quem ^h Horreum Mysteriorumⁱ inscripsit, quo totam sacram scripturam brevissimis notis dilucidat. Ubi, præfatione in Matthæum sic de Ephræmo scribit: — Commentaria Ephræmi in Matthæum et Lucam laudat Corderius in Catena Patrum. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 57, 58. †† See Vol. ii. p. 158. and p. 419—421. ^k Expositio Ephræmi in Testamentum Novum, ejus meminerunt Barsalibæus et Barhebræus lo-

cis supra laudatis, nondum ad manus nostras pervenit. Ib. p. 63. ^l Fragmenta

[Græce] in Evangelium. Cod. Vat. 663. 778. et 1190. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 157.

^m Quatuor illi leprosi, tametsi sædam per se præferunt speciem, si tamen ea parte spectentur, qua fausta nunciârunt, sanctos quatuor Evangelistas nobis pulchre repræsentant, cogitantibus, per istos innotuisse universo orbi Christi Salvatoris nostri gratiam, ac per Christum mundo assertam libertatem. In 2 libr. Reg. cap. vii. 3. T. i. Syr. p. 537. D. E. ⁿ Coronam

itaque ex auro argentoque fabrefactam a principibus donatam, evangelii doctrinam vitæ pharmacum esse intellige a quatuor Evangelistis scripto traditam, et voce promulgatam. In Zach. cap. vi. T. ii. Syr. p. 295. C. ^o Et cum impudica illa

femina, cujus vitæ emendatio in sacro Evangeliorum codice tantopere commendatur, tuorum scelerum veniam iteratis singulibus flagita. Paræm. 67. T. iii. Syr. 538. A.

In the same Syriac works is quoted ^y the epistle to the Hebrews, as the apostle Paul's.

8. Unquestionably, he also received the first epistle ^z of St. Peter, and ^a the first epistle of St. John. Quotations of them are to be found in the Syriac works, of which I have given proofs below in the margin.

9. Whether Ephrem received also those catholic epistles, which were sometimes doubted of, is not so certain. Mill in his *Prolegomena* says, that ^b Ephrem received the epistle of St. James, the second of St. Peter, and the epistle of St. Jude, and the second epistle of St. John, they being quoted by him. He does not say where; but he must mean Ephrem's Greek works: I will therefore first consider the Syriac, and then the Greek works of this writer.

10. Ephrem has an exhortation, *Let ^{bb} your speech be yea yea, nay nay*; and in the margin is marked a reference to Ja. v. 12. but he might as well intend Matt. v. 37.

11. Ephrem says, *the ^c day of the Lord is a thief*, and may come upon us unawares: where has been thought to be a reference to 2 Pet. iii. 19. *But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night*: but he might as well have an eye to Matt. xxiv. 43, 44. or Luke xii. 39, 40. or 1 Thess. v. 2. *For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night.* See also ver. 4.

12. There has been supposed to be a reference ^d to 2 Pet. iii. 7. but I do not think it certain.

So far from the Syriac works. I now proceed to the Greek.

^y Vid. Comment. in libr. Judic. T. i. Syr. p. 322. B. et p. 328. B. In 1 libr. Regnor. p. 460. B. Paræn. iv. T. iii. Syr. p. 395. D. et alibi.

^z Speculatores ergo et exploratores populi Dei fuere Prophetae: *Scrutantes in quod vel quale tempus significaret in eis Spiritus Christi prænuntians eas, quæ in Christo sunt passionēs, et posteriores glorias.* [1 Pet. i. 11.] Comment. in 1 Sam. i. 1. T. Syr. i. p. 331. A.

Inde ad nos digressus vocavit nos *de tenebris in admirabile lumen suum.* [1 Pet. ii. 9] In selecta scriptur. loc. T. ii. Syr. p. 330. A. Vid. eund. loc. iterum citat. Paræn. 68. T. iii. Syr. p. 539. A.

Qui peccatum non fecit, nec inventus est dolus in ore ejus. [1 Pet. ii. 22.] In Zachar. T. ii. Syr. p. 298. D.

^a — Jesu Christi pariter imaginem delineavit, qui totius mundi peccata tulit

et abstulit, cum factus est propitiatio pro peccatis nostris, nec pro peccatis nostris tantum, sed etiam pro totius mundi. [1 Jo. ii. 2.] In Zachar. T. ii. Syr. p. 286. A. B.

^b Exemptum Ecclesiarum Palæstinæ secuta est Ecclesia Syriaca, ut apparet ex Ephraem Edesseni Diaconi scriptis, ubi epistola hæc aliquoties citata est, tamquam Jacobi Apostoli, et quidem Fratris Domini. Proleg. n. 204. Vid. et n. 209, 210. 213. 222, 223.

^{bb} Os enim, divinarum laudum instrumentum, Jurare non decet. Sit Sermo vester, *Est est, Non non.* De Diversis Serm. 14. T. iii. Syr. p. 643. D.

^c Dies namque Domini fur est, inopinum opprimet. In Select. Scripturæ loca. T. ii. Syr. p. 342. A.

^d Et posthac pœnam ignis feret [diabolus] ipsi reservatam in novissima die. In Gen. T. i. Syr. p. 136. E.

13. In every volume of the Greek works, that is, in the first, second, and third, in each of them, are many expressions of the epistle of St. James.

14. The second epistle of St. Peter is also quoted in every one of the Greek volumes. I shall mark * two or three quotations, which are very express; one of which contains the second chapter of that epistle from ver. 9, to the end.

15. The second epistle of John is quoted in this manner: 'This^f is not my saying, but the word of John the divine, who says, *Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, has not God*, ver. 9.

16. The third epistle of St. John is quoted in this manner: 'The^g scripture says, *I have no greater joy, than to hear, that my children walk in truth.*'

17. I would just observe here, that in these Greek works, where St. John's first epistle is quoted, he^h is often called The Divine or Theologue.

18. In these works the epistle of St. Jude is quoted several times. In one placeⁱ the whole epistle of Jude is transcribed; again, he is^k called another disciple of Christ, after having before quoted largely the second epistle of Peter.

19. Such then is the notice taken of these catholic epistles in the Greek works; but how far they are to be relied upon as genuine, and uncorrupted, may be hard to say. I rather think, it cannot be depended upon, that Ephrem is here truly represented. Had not Ephrem many occasions to quote the second epistle of Peter, and the epistle of Jude, in his writings against heretics, and in his practical works, preserved in Syriac? Can there be any good reason assigned, why they should have been there totally omitted, if they had been reputed parts of sacred scripture by himself, and by those for whom he wrote? For my own part, I must own, that I prefer the Syriac works much before the Greek, which at best are translations only, in which too the translator may have inserted some of his own sentiments.

* Βοα δὲ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Πῆρος ὁ κορυφαῖος τῶν ἀποστόλων.—Ἡ ἡμεῖς κυρίως ὡς κλητὶκὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐργάζεται. κ. λ. [2 Pet. iii. 10.] Interr. et Resp. T. ii. Gr. p. 387. B. Λίβει δὲ καὶ ὁ μακάριος ἀποστόλος Πῆρος· Οὐδὲ κυρίως εὐσεβεῖς ἐν ποικίλοις ὀνείσμασι· κ. λ. [2 Pet. ii. 9—22.] Adv. Impudicitiam. T. iii. Gr. p. 60, 61.

^f Οὐκ ἐμὸς γὰρ ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ τῶ θεολογῶν Ἰωάννη υἱὸς λεσίτου· Πᾶς ὁ παραβάων. κ. λ. De Amore Pauperum. T. iii. Gr. p. 52. F.

^g Λίβει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Μειζὺνα τῶν ἡκ^h χαρὰι, ἢ αὐκὴν τὰ μα τικὰ περι-

παύσινα ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. Ad Imitat. Proverb. T. i. Gr. p. 76. F.

^h Ἀντι τὴν λέξιν ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης. De Compunctione Animæ. T. i. Gr. p. 31. B. Vid. et in Secund. Domini Advent. T. ii. Gr. p. 209. E. et De Caritate. T. iii. Gr. p. 13. F. et passim. ⁱ Vid. Paræn. 41. T. ii. Gr. p. 153. C. et Paræn. 43. p. 161. E.

^k Διαλεχθεὶς δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ἄλλος μαθητὴς λέγει. Ἰωάννης Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ τραπεζιτικοῦ. κ. λ. Adv. Impudicit. T. iii. Gr. p. 61, 62.

20. Dr. Asseman says, that ¹ Ephrem received the book of the Revelation, and seems to give good proof of it. The discourse quoted by him in manuscript, when he wrote his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, has been since published with Ephrem's Syriac works, where it may be ^m seen.

21. Indeed the Revelation is quoted or referred to several times in the Syriac works, lately published at Rome, if their genuineness and integrity may be relied upon.

22. The words of Rev. iii. 3. are ⁿ quoted; there seems to be a reference to ^o xix. 9. and to ^p chap. xxi.

23. I would add farther: The commentaries are a sort of chain; that is, beside Ephrem's comments at large, here and there are also inserted notes or explications of others. In one of those notes, of James bishop of Edessa, who ¹ flourished in the latter part of the seventh century, there is ^r a long quotation out of the book of the Revelation. However, in another place Dr. Asseman assures us, that ^s James of Edessa did not write any commentary upon that book.

24. Upon the whole, we can say with certainty, that Ephrem received those books of the New Testament, which were always received by catholic Christians: what was his judgment concerning those five catholic epistles, which were sometimes doubted of, and concerning the Revelation, I leave every reader to consider, and determine for himself; for I have endeavoured to give all the light I am able.

IV. The general divisions of the books of scripture, and marks of respect for them, are such as these; I mean in the Syriac works, the Latin version of which I shall transcribe below: not having by any means an equal regard for the Greek works, as I have intimated several times; and therefore I take little notice of them.

¹ In hoc sermone citat S. Doctor Apocalypsim Joannis, tanquam canonicam Scripturæ partem. ^a In Apocalypsi vidit Joannes ingentem et admirabilem librum ^a a Deo scriptum, septem signaculis ob-^r signatum. Quod ideo notavi, ut constaret Syrorum antiquissimorum de illius libri auctoritate judicium contra Ebedjesu, qui in Catalogo manuscripto inter libros canonicos Apocalypsim non nominat. Assem. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 141.

^m Vidit in Apocalypsi sua Joannes librum magnum et admirabilem, a Deo scriptum, et septem sigillis munitum. Qui scriptum legeret, nullus erat. — [Apoc. v. 1, 2, 3] In selecta Scripturæ loc. seu Sermon. Exeget. T. ii. Syr. p. C.

ⁿ Et rursus: Si ergo non *vigilaveris, veniam ad te tanquam fur, et nescies, qua hora veniam ad te.* Paræn. 61. T. iii. Syr. p. 599. A.

^o Summus rerum dominator — vocavit nos ad agni nuptias. Paræn. 68. T. iii. Syr. p. 538. D.

^p Ipsa est mysticum illud *cælum novum*, in quo Rex regum tanquam in sede sua inhabitavit. De Diversis. Sermon. 3. T. iii. Syr. p. 607. C.

^q Vid. Assem. Bib. Or. T. i. cap. xl. p. 468.

^r In Gen. T. i. Syr. p. 192.

^s Apocalypsim Johannis nec Sobensius recensuit, nec Barhebræus aut Jacobus Edessenus exposuere. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 8. not. 2.

1. He speaks ^a of the oracles of the prophets and apostles, by which Jews and Gentiles are all brought together in one body.

2. He says, that ^a Christ is the precious and corner-stone between the two Testaments, the prophets and the apostles.

3. He speaks again ^a of the predictions of the prophets, and the preaching of the apostles, concurring together, and completely harmonious; which gives us full assurance of the nativity, miracles, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

4. Arguing against Marcion, and others, he says: 'This ^r is not mentioned by Moses in his Pentateuch, nor is it taught ^r by the prophets, nor delivered to us by the apostles.'

5. Happy ^z is he, who teaches the principles of true religion delivered by the apostles and prophets.

6. Such are the general divisions of the books of scripture, both of the Old and the New Testament, which are to be found in this writer; many more like passages may be seen in him: I refer to a ^a few only.

V. Ephrem shews his respect for the sacred scriptures by such expressions as these.

1. In a funeral oration for a bishop, a part of his commendation is this: Like ^b Moses he taught and governed the people committed to his charge. The volume of the divine scriptures he held out to them as a pillar of fire to guide them: and what follows.

^a Futurum enim erat, ut a multis gentibus, in unum Spiritum convenientibus, Prophetarum et Apostolorum oracula spiritualium tympanorum concentu celebrarentur, et Judæi atque Gentiles in unius populi corpus coalescerent. In libr. Judic. cap. xxi. 19. 21. T. i. Syr. p. 330.

^a Tropologice. Lapis positus inter duos terminos Christum significabat, lapidem pretiosum et angularem, inter duo testamenta, Prophetas scilicet et Apostolos locatum. Christum autem venturum prædixerunt Prophetæ præeuntes, eundemque sequentes Apostoli jam venisse nuntiaverunt. In 1 Sam. vii. 12. Ib. p. 347.

^x Allegorizæ congruunt humeruli, seu columellæ mare sustinentes, quæ Prophetarum vaticinia et Apostolorum prædicationem significant: quæ duo simul conjuncta, mutuoque sibi convenientia, fidem de Divini Verbi incarnatione, miraculis, passione, atque resurrectione, sustinent, et mirifice confirmant. Congruenter ergo boves duodecim æneum hoc mare portant, juxta ecclesiasticum, id est, allegoricum

sensum, Apostolos interpretare et Prophetas, Christi nomen per universum orbem specie quadam triumpho circumferentes. In 1 libr. Regn. cap. vii. T. i. Syr. p. 460.

^y Illud Nimirum nec Moyses in suo Pentateucho meminit, nec indicaverunt Prophetæ, nec Apostoli tradiderunt. Adv. Hæret. Serm. 14. T. ii. Syr. p. 468. D.

^z — atque veræ religionis dogmata ab Apostolis et Prophetis tradita promulgavit. Adv. Scrutat. Serm. 3. T. iii p. 4. D. Vid. et Serm. 6. ibid. p. 12. F.

^a In Num. cap. xxxi. ver. 6. et 22. T. i. Syr. p. 267. In Deut. xxi. 25. p. 278. In 1 Regn. cap. vii. ver. 21. p. 459. Adv. Hæret. Serm. 22. T. ii. Syr. p. 489. A. Serm. 23. p. 489. E. F.

^b Vir mitissimus, et in hac parte Moyse comparandus, populum sibi commissum docuit et rexit. Divinarum Scripturarum codicem ei pro columna ignis proposuit. &c. Funer. Can. i. T. iii. Syr. p. 225. F. Vid. et Can. xi. p. 241. F.

2. I esteem ^c no man more happy than him, who diligently reads the scriptures delivered to us by the Spirit of God, and thinks how he may order his conversation by the precepts of them.

3. The ^d divine scriptures, he says, are the keys of knowledge.

4. The ^e truth written in the sacred volume of the gospel is a perfect rule. Nothing can be taken from it, nor added to it, without great guilt.

5. So says ^f Paul, in whom Christ speaks.

6. All ^g who hear or read the divine scriptures with attention and care will attain to the true sense of them.

VI. I shall now add some select passages, beginning with some interpretations of texts of scripture.

1. In his comment upon Gen. vi. 2. by ^h the sons of God, he understands the descendants of Seth, and by the daughters of men, women of the posterity of Cain. And he elsewhere argues, largely, that ⁱ angels never were in love with women, and could not have children by them. And says, that women never are pregnant, or bear children, if they are kept from men: and that the fairest and best dressed woman would no more tempt an angel, than so many putrefied corpses.

^c Ego vero neminem eo feliciorē dicam, quam qui Scripturis Divino Spiritu nobis traditis, aures eodem Spiritu plenas præbeat, et codicem percurrēdo prudenter cogitet, quomodo præceptum sibi ob oculos propositum observare cum laude possit. Paræm. xviii. T. iii. Syr. p. 447. C. Vid. et A. B. ^d Divinæ literæ scientiæ claves sunt. De Paradiso. Serm. 6. T. iii. Syr. p. 576. E. F.

^e Quemadmodum Alphabeti corpus suis constat integrum membris, nec est ubi quodquod demas aut adjicias; sic veritas literis consignata, et sacro Evangelii Codice comprehensa, perfecta mensura est, cui quidpiam addere aut detrāhere nefas et crimen est. Adv. Hær. Serm. 22. T. ii. Syr. p. 485. A.

^f Paulus, in quo Christus loquebatur, cum dolore et lachrymis dicebat. In select. Scripturæ loca. T. ii. Syr. p. 334. D.

^g Divinas Scripturas quicumque legunt, vel excepta auribus illorum oracula oculis mentis diligenter considerant, sensum etiam assequuntur. Ibid. p. 344. B.

^h Filios Dei etiam filios Seth appellavit, qui utpote filii justi Seth, populus Dei dicti sunt. Filii autem hominum pulchri, quæ populi Dei oculis rapuerunt, Caini soboles erant, quæ per

cultum ornatumque sui sexus Sethianæ juventuti laqueum fecerant. In Gen. T. i. Syr. p. 48. C. D.

ⁱ Cæterum si porro pergant, contentantque angelos liberorum procreationi operam aliquando dedisse; cogitent, nec hodie fore difficile desertoribus angelis opprimere feminam, et filios generare. Hic dæmones. Hic mulieres. Explorent, num liberos gignant. Adsunt testes ejusmodi deliramenta resellentes cœlibus bene multæ, quæ a viris perpetuo segregatæ matres nunquam esse potuerunt. Una et singularis exstuit Maria, quæ citra viri operam mater fuit, et virgo permanxit, eo quod Deo difficile nil excogitari potest. Et siquidem angeli patres esse potuerunt, virginem mansisse Reparatoris nostri genetricem, inepte miramur. Gratissimum quidem Satanæ fuisset, virgines dæmonum operâ concipere et parere, quo haberet quas Mariæ opponeret virgines.—Ornavere se virgines Madianitæ, populoque Israelitarum se conspiciendæ præbuere. Illorum oculis rapuere, eripere mentem. Attamen illa pulchritudinum miracula angelos non magis quam putrefactia cadavera movere potuerunt. Adv. Hær. Serm. 19. T. ii. Syr. p. 478. A.—F.

2. Upon

2. Upon Ex. ii. 11, 12. he says, that^k the Egyptian, whom Moses slew, was one of Pharaoh's taskmasters, and the most cruel of them all; and that Moses had before often reproved him, but he would not be persuaded to mildness.

3. Upon Deut. xviii. 15—20. he says, that^l God performed the promise there made by sending Joshua, and other princes and prophets. But the promise was completely fulfilled in Jesus Christ, who, like Moses, was a lawgiver, and delivered laws tending to bring men to eminent virtue and holiness.

4. I do not discern any thing very remarkable in his notes^m upon Job xix. 23—26. for which reason I do not transcribe them. He does not take any noticeⁿ of what is at the end of the book of Job in the Seventy: *that it was written, Job should be raised up again with those, whom the Lord should raise.*

5. Ezek. i. 1. *The heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God.*] The^o meaning, he says, is, that to the prophet's mind the gates of heaven were opened, and with the eyes of his spirit he saw sublime and hidden mysteries.

6. Ephrem^p has an interpretation of Zech. iii. 1—4. which I have not found in Grotius, or any other modern commentator: it deserves therefore to be particularly taken notice of. *Satan, standing at the right-hand of the angel of the Lord, to resist him,* represents the neighbours of the Jewish people, who were adversaries to them. *The brand plucked out of the fire,* is the Jewish people burned in the fire of the Babylonish captivity, and now snatched out of the burning. And Joshua the son of Josedech the high-priest, *clothed in filthy garments,* represents the abject and deplorable condition of the Jewish people in the Babylonish captivity. The order for *clothing him*

^k Incidit in hoc tempus Egyptii cædes. Præfectus hic erat, quem Moyses occidit, hominem nempe omnium Pharaonis procerum crudelissimum, qui a Moysæ sæpe sæpius admonitus, sapere nunquam didicerat. In Exod. T. i. Syr. p. 198. F.

^l Cæterum, etsi Deus, quod hic pollicetur, suo tempore præstitisse visus fuit, quando Moysi Josuam, et huic deinceps alios Duces Regesque substituit: attamen vere et merito dicendum est, in Christo tandem integre et absolute eam promissionem impletam fuisse. Nam etsi post hæc tempora plures Prophetæ prodierint, nullus tamen Moysi similis fuit, qui testamentum et leges conderet. Quod certe Christus præstitit, novum instituens testamentum, et leges condens hominem ad perfectum cumulatamque virtutem perducentes. In Deut. T. i. Syr. p. 277. E. F.

^m Vid. T. ii. Syr. p. 8. ibid. p. 19.

ⁿ Id est, patefactæ sunt Prophetæ menti cæli fores, oculisque spiritus spectare licuit arcana sublimia et occultissima. In Ez. T. ii. Syr. p. 165. C.

^p Satanas adversarios Judæorum representat, illorum ditionem circum insidentes, ipsique infestis. — *Hic est torris erutus de igne:* i. e. lignum adustum annos post septuaginta Babylonico ab igne extractum: *tionem*, vid. ipsum Sacerdotem, et universum Israelitarum populum vocat, captivitatis ærumnis nuper ereptum. — *Auferte sordidas vestes ab eo, et induite illum vestibus optimis.* Vestimenta Sacerdoti detracta contractas Babylone sordes designant, et præteritam ignominiam, quæ velut exauctoratus Minister, sacris insignibus privatus atque ab aris remoto ibidem exularet. In Zach. T. ii. Syr. p. 285. A. B. C.

with change of raiment denotes the purpose of God to alter the condition of the Jewish people for the better, and to bless and prosper them, and to restore his worship among them.

7. Upon Zech. vi. 12. *Behold^a the man whose name is the East* [or the *Branch*]. This man is Zerubbabel, to whom the Spirit by the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah gave glory like the splendor of the rising sun.—Ver. 13. *Even he shall build the temple of the Lord*: the spoils of Magog affording sufficient for the expences of the work. *And he shall bear the glory*, that is, receive glory from the conquest of Magog. *And shall sit, and rule upon his throne*, with firm and durable power, from which none shall be able to remove him, or cast him down. *And Joshua shall be a priest upon his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both*. Which denotes the harmony and agreement, which by the fear of the Lord shall be established between Joshua the son of Josedech and Zerubbabel the prince and governor of the people. But the things here said under divers symbols of Zerubbabel are understood in the way of allegory of Christ, the true East, and splendor of the Father.

8. Ephrem's comment upon Zech. xii. 10—14. I shall transcribe^r at the bottom of the page in the Latin version, without translating it into English.

^a *Ecce vir, et nomen ejus Oriens.*] Zorobabel est, cui Spiritus vaticiniis et auctoritate Aggei et Zachariae gloriam, et quasi Orientis solis splendorem contulit.—*Et ipse exstruet templum Domini*, sumtus vid. et expensas sufficientibus populi Gog spoliis. *Ipse accipiet gloriam*, a victa dissipataque gente Magog. *Et sedebit, et dominabitur super solio suo*, firma et stabili dominatione, qua nemo illum deiciat. *Et Jesus erit Sacerdos super solio suo, et consilium bonum erit inter illos duos*. Significat concordiam et pacem timore Domini firmatam inter Jesum filium Josedech et Zorobabelem populi principem et ducem. Ceterum quæ hic de Zorobabele per varia symbola prædicantur, per allegoriam prædicta accipiuntur de Christo, cum ipse sit verus Oriens, et ortus ex Patre splendor. In Zach. cap. vi. T. ii. Syr. p. 294, 295. ^r *Plangent eum planctu quasi super unigenitum*. Juxta historiam in hunc sensum dicta accipiuntur. *Aspicient ad me, in eum, quem crucifixerunt*. *Aspicient ad me*: id est, clamabunt ad me quicumque Judam Macchabæum amaverint, dolentque modo confossum et interfectum a Gentibus: hunc quasi filium

unicum affectu plane materno lugebunt, ac frangentur dolore propter eum, ut frangi solet mater propter primogenitum et unicum. In illa die magnus erit planctus in Jerusalem, sicut planctus Baramon in valle Mageddo: i. e. talis erit luctus, utique magnus, qualis fuit die, quo Josias Rex in valle Mageddo ab Ægyptiis confossum occubuit. Constat siquidem ex historia ipsa Judæ Macchabæi mortem Judæos ingenti luctu profecutos fuisse. Is namque Jerosolymæ invasores, populoque Judæorum semper infestos magnis cladibus attriverat. Quare ob acerbum ejus interitum Jerosolymæ præcipue cives in maximis luctibus fuerunt.—*Lugebit terra per singulas familias*: id est, omnes morebunt familiæ, singulæ per turmas suas. *Familia David seorsum, et mulieres ejus seorsum*. &c. i. e. separatim ab uxoribus conjuges, et omnes quæcumque feminae a viris. Hæc quidem, ut dixi, secundum historiam, acta sunt in funere Judæi Macchabæi. Nihilominus ex arcana et vera significatione verborum de Domini morte intelligenda sunt. In Zach. T. ii. Syr. p. 306.

9. I would likewise place ^a below, in the like manner, Ephrem's comment upon Zech. xiii. 1. and also two passages more explaining in his way the ^c former and the ^a latter part of Zech. xiv. 9.

10. Ephrem supposeth, that ^a our Lord wrought no miracles before his baptism, when he was thirty years of age.

11. He intimates, that ^c Christ's ministry lasted two years, he ^a living on this earth two and thirty years.

12. He has some remarks ^a upon our Saviour's three miracles of raising the dead, Jairus's daughter, the widow of Naim's son, and Lazarus.

13. He supposeth, that ^b the apostles had, or chose to themselves several provinces: Peter, he says, preached at Rome, John at Ephesus, Matthew in Palestine, and Thomas in the Indies. But this account is imperfect, as every one may perceive. Here is no mention of St. Paul's travels, so well known from the Acts, and his own epistles.

14. In several places he speaks of the ^c success of the gospel. The ^d Jewish prophets, he says, for a long time were of little service; but when joined by the apostles, the empire of sin

^a Et aperietur fons salutis domui David, et habitatoribus Jerusalem.] Habet hic in superficie locus hunc significatum. Populo Judæorum, ne porro trilitia suffocetur, ratus nullam afflicto superesse spem, Jonas Judæ Macchabæi frater, salutis pandet viam, quove a fonte eadem petenda sit, monstrabit. Ex interpretatione vero spirituali, et quidem verissima, discimus fontem salutis esse effluvium pii sanguinis et aquæ sanctissimæ, quæ de latere Domini in cruce manarunt ad asperionem, et ad emundationem. Ibid. p. 306. et 307.

^b Et erit Dominus Rex super universam terram.] Clarum est, hunc locum ad felicissimam Macchabæorum tempora pertinere, quando depulsa idolatria, quam Antiochus induxerat, unius Dei cultum Judæa universa amplexa est. Nihilominus, quæ hic adumbrata vides, per Christi adventum absoluta et perfecta sunt. Ibid. p. 310. C.

^c In die illa erit Dominus unus, et erit nomen ejus unum.] Hoc, quod dixi ad Macchabæorum tempus, et Judæorum ditionem pertinere, in toto terrarum orbe perfectum est, quando promulgato evangelio mundus universus in eum credidit, et agnovit ipsum esse Deum. Ibid. E.

^d Nam usque ad suum in Jordane baptismum Christus nullum patravit miraculum. In Ezech. cap. i. T. ii. Syr. p. 165. D.

^e Horæ itaque duæ postremæ designant duos annos, quibus Christus seipsum miraculis et signis manifestavit, et nostræ salutis opus moriendo absolvit. In 2 Reg. xx. 10. T. ii. Syr. p. 362. C.

^a In selecta Scripturæ loca. T. ii. Syr. p. 389.

^b — quia similiter Apostoli provincias sortiti sunt. Simon Romam docuit, Johannes Ephesum, Mattheus Palestinam, et Indorum regiones Thomas. In 1 lib. Reg. cap. iv. 1. T. i. Syr. p. 453.

^c Botrus a suo pendens palmitis, et vestic gestatus, Christum plane representat ab utroque Prophetarum et Apostolorum cætu per orbem universum magnifice circumvectum. In Num. xiii. T. i. Syr. p. 259.

^d Allegoria. Gedeonis buccinæ evangelii tubam præsignificabant, Evangelii namque personante tuba, et coruscante sacramentorum Christi lampade, peccati imperium eversum est. Rursus hydropis, inclusas lampadas continentes, Judæorum synagogas significabant, intra quas scripta Prophetarum oracula oppressa et abscondita diu jacuerunt. Postquam vero Judæi virtute crucis Christi fracti contritique fuere, continuo prophetarum lampadum fulgor emicuit, et Apostolorum luce adjutus totum terrarum orbem implevit. In cap. vii. Judic. ver. 21. T. i. Syr. p. 318, 319.

was soon destroyed, and the world was enlightened with divine knowledge.

15. Ephrem often asserts in strong terms the * powers of free-will in men.

16. He says, miracles ^f were then wrought by the reliques of martyrs, or at their sepulchres.

C H A P. CIII.

E B E D J E S U.

- I. *His time.* II. *A catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament.*
III. *Remarks upon it.*

I. HAVING given an account of Ephrem of Edeffa, it will not be amiss to take in another learned Syrian writer, though he be much later in time. I mean * Ebedjesu, of the sect of the Nestorians, who was bishop of Nisibis, called by the Syrians Soba, in the latter part of the 13th century, and died in the year 1318. As ^b he had been before bishop of Sigara from the year 1285, I place him as flourishing about that time.

II. Dr. Asseman first published an accurate edition of his ^c Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writings at Rome, in 1725. Ebed-

* Sita est in tua potestate salus, tibi-
que est libera optio eligendi vitam, vel in-
teritum. Vide, ut rebus tuis tempestive
provid eas, antequam elabatur tempus pœni-
tentiae, et misericordiae fores claudantur.
Paræn. 4. T. iii. Syr. p. 411. F.

Jugum tuum mea ego voluntate suscepi.
Non tu me reluctantem illud subire coegisti.
Egomet sponte mea ad excolendum agrum
tuum me obligavi. Sed heu semen a te
acceptum in spem uberrimae messis datum
feminare neglexi. &c. Paræn. 5. T. iii.
Syr. p. 415. A. B. Vid. Paræn. 13. p.
431. Paræn. 22. p. 455. D. E. De Di-
versis Serm. p. 672, 673. Vid. et De Li-
bero humanæ voluntatis arbitrio Sermones
quatuor. Ibid. p. 359—366.

^f Jam vero intueri vitam in Martyrum
reliquis conditam. Quis enim neget, illis
manere vitam, quando videt ipsorum etiam
titulos vivere? Res compertissima est, de
qua nullus dubitet. In sel. Scriptur. loc.

T. ii. Syr. p. 349, 350.

* Ebedjesu, hoc est servus Jesu.—Fuit
autem Ebedjesu, Catalogi hujus auctor,
cognomento Bar-Bricha, id est, Filius Be-
nedicti, gente Chaldeus, secta Nestorianus,
dignitate Episcopus: floruitque sub Jabal-
laha, Chaldeorum Nestorianorum Patriar-
cha, a quo Metropolita Sobæ et Armeniæ
ordinatus est. Obiit sub initium mensis
Novembris anni Græcorum 1630. Christi
1318. Assem. B. Or. T. iii. p. 3. in notis 2.

^b Primum fuerat Episcopus Sigaræ et
Arabie, circa annum Christi 1285. ut ad-
notatur in elegantissimo Syriaco Evangelio-
rum codice, qui exstat in Bibliotheca Col-
legii Urbani de Propaganda Fide. Deinde
ad archiepiscopatum Sobæ et Armeniæ e-
vectus est, ut supra dixi. Soba autem Sy-
ris eadem est ac Nisibis. Id. ib. not. 3.

^c Carmen Ebedjesu, continens Catalo-
gum Librorum omnium Ecclesiasticorum.
Ibid. p. 3.

jesu

jesu in his introduction proposeth to give ^d a catalogue of all the divine books, and all other ecclesiastical writings; he first enumerates the books of the Old Testament, and then the New; this latter part I shall transcribe.

‘ Having * mentioned the writers of the Old Testament, I
 ‘ proceed to those of the New. The first of which is Matthew,
 ‘ who published his gospel in Palestine, written in Hebrew;
 ‘ the next is Mark, who preached in Latin, in the famous city
 ‘ of Rome; then Luke, who taught and wrote at Alexandria,
 ‘ in the Greek language; and John, who wrote his gospel at
 ‘ Ephesus, in the Greek tongue. And the Acts of the apostles,
 ‘ which Luke inscribed to Theophilus. Three epistles like-
 ‘ wise, which in every book [or copy] and language are as-
 ‘ cribed to apostles, namely, to James, Peter, and John, and
 ‘ are called catholic. And fourteen epistles of the great apos-
 ‘ tle Paul: the epistle to the Romans, written at Corinth, and
 ‘ sent from thence; the first epistle to the Corinthians, written
 ‘ at Ephesus, and sent from thence by the hands of Timothy;
 ‘ the second to the Corinthians, written at Philippi in great
 ‘ Macedonia, and sent by the hands of Titus. The epistle to
 ‘ the Galatians Paul wrote at Rome, and sent it by the hands
 ‘ of Titus, a chosen and approved vessel; the epistle to the
 ‘ Ephesians was written at Rome, and sent from Paul himself
 ‘ by the hands of Tychicus; the epistle to the Philippians was
 ‘ written at Rome, and sent by Epaphroditus, a beloved bro-
 ‘ ther; the epistle likewise to the Colossians was written at
 ‘ Rome, and sent by Tychicus, a disciple of the truth; the
 ‘ first epistle to the Thessalonians was written in the city of
 ‘ Athens, and sent by the hands of Timothy; the second to
 ‘ the Thessalonians was written at Laodicea in Pisidia [Phry-
 ‘ gia], and sent with Timothy; the first epistle to Timothy

‘ Scribere aggredior Carmen admirabile:
 In quo Libros Divinos,
 Et omnes compositiones Ecclesiasticas
 Omnium priorum et posteriorum
 Proponam lectoribus. Ibid. p. 4.

‘ Nunc, absoluto Veteri,
 Aggrediamur jam Novum Testamen-
 tum;
 Cujus caput est Matthæus, qui He-
 braice
 In Palestina scripsit.

Post hunc Marcus, qui Romæ
 Locutus est in celeberrima Roma:
 Et Lucas, qui Alexandriæ
 Græce dixit scripsitque.

Et Joannes, qui Ephesi
 Græco sermone exaravit Evangelium.
 Actus quoque Apostolorum,
 Quos Lucas Theophilo inscripsit.

Tres etiam epistolæ, quæ inscribuntur
 Apostolis in omni codice et lingua,
 Jacobo scilicet, et Petro, et Joanni,
 Et Catholicæ nuncupantur.

Apostoli autem Pauli magni
 Epistolæ quatuordecim.

Epistola ad Romanos,
 Quæ ex Corintho scripta est. &c. &c.

Ebedjesu Catalog. ap. Asseman. Bib. Or.
 T. iii. p. 8—12.

' was written at Laodicea, a city of Pisidia [Phrygia], and
' sent by Luke; the second epistle to Timothy was written at
' Rome, and sent by the same Luke, the physician and evan-
' gelist; the epistle to Titus was written at Nicopolis, and
' sent and carried by Epaphroditus; the epistle to Philemon
' was written at Rome, and sent by Onesimus, servant of the
' same Philemon; the epistle to the Hebrews was written in
' Italy, and sent by Timothy, son according to the spirit.'

III. Upon this catalogue we may make a few remarks.

1. The order of the books of the New Testament should be observed. The gospels, the Acts of the apostles, three catholic epistles, and St. Paul's fourteen epistles: which too are mentioned in the order, which now obtains among us; the epistle to the Romans first, and that to the Hebrews last. And by Dr. Asseman we are assured, that ' here Ebedjesu followed the order, which is in general use among the Syrians: in which order also the books are placed in the ancient manuscript copies of the New Testament. Gregory Barhebraeus observed also the same order in his commentaries. But James of Edessa, in a book written by him, first mentions the Acts of the apostles, then the catholic epistles of James, Peter, and John; after that Paul's epistles, and lastly the four gospels.

2. What * Ebedjesu says of the places and languages, in which the several gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were written, we are assured by Asseman, is agreeable to the common opinion of the Syrians in general.

3. It is not needful to examine the accounts here given of the places where ^b St. Paul's epistles were written, or the per-

* In recensendis Novi Testamenti libris vulgatum apud Syros ordinem sequitur Sobensis, quo Evangelii subjunguntur Actus Apostolorum, deinde Epistolæ Catholicæ Jacobi, Petri, et Joannis, mox Epistolæ Pauli. Hunc ordinem et codices antiqui manuscripti representant: quo etiam Barhebraeus Novum Testamentum commentariis illustravit, in suo Horreo Mysteriorum, ut notavi Tom. ii. Bib. Or. p. 282. Jacobus vero Edessenus in libro, cui titulus Onomasticon, cit. tom. ii. p. 499. primo loco Actus Apostolorum ponit, deinde Epistolæ Catholicas Jacobi, Petri, et Joannis: postea Epistolas Pauli, postremo quatuor Evangelia. Assem. B. Or. T. iii. p. 8. not. 9.

† Hæc est communis Syrorum sententia de sermone, quo primum Evangelia conscripta dicuntur: Matthæi scilicet Hebraice in Palæstina: Marci Romane, hoc est, Latine Romæ: Luca: Græ-

ce Alexandriæ, et Joannis item Græce Ephesi. In eandem sententiam adnotatum legitur ad calcem omnium quotquot vidi Syriaco sermone exaratorum tum recentium tum antiquorum Evangeliorum. Nec dissentiant Barsalibæus et Barhebraeus in præfatione ad Evangelia. Quod autem Hebraica lingua, qua Matthæus scripsisse dicitur, non sit illa, quæ revera Hebræorum propria est, sed Chaldaica, seu Syriaca, quæ Judæis post captivitatem Babylonicam, Christi Apostolorumque temporibus, vernacula erat, docet idem Barsalibæus præfatione in Matthæum. Assem. ib. p. 8. not.

^b Ubinam scriptæ, et per quos missæ, [Pauli epistolæ quatuordecim,] ad calcem manuscriptorum codicum diligenter adnotatum est, tam in Versione Syriaca, quam in Græcis exemplaribus, unde quæ hic a Sobensi affirmantur, descripta sunt. Asseman. Ib. p. 10. notis.

sons

sons by whom they were sent: but it is worth notice, that the epistle to the Ephesians is here intitled, as with us.

4. Ebedjesu mentions only three catholic epistles, omitting the second of Peter, and second and third of John, and the epistle of Jude: which, as we are also assured by Asseman, is agreeable¹ to the common sentiments of the Syrians. And he refers to a work of James of Edessa, the title of which² I shall put in the margin, confirming the account, that there are but three catholic epistles in the ancient Syriac version.

5. The book of the Revelation likewise is omitted: nor is it, as Asseman¹ says, in the ancient Syriac version; nor did Barhebræus, or James of Edessa, write commentaries upon it: but Ephrem, he says, quotes it as a canonical book of scripture; and from Ephrem's quotation of that book, he argues, may² be learned and concluded, what was the sentiment of the most ancient Syrians about it.

6. I place below³ another note of that learned writer, where he says, that the Revelation is wanting in the ancient Syriac

¹ Ex communi Syrorum sententiâ tres tantum Canonicas Epistolas recenset, quarum scilicet de auctoritate Syri nunquam dubitarunt, quæque ab initio inter canonicos libros in Syriaca versione simplici collocatæ sunt. Sane (ut verbis utar Fabricii Tom. iii. Bibliothecæ Græcæ p. 145.)² in antiquis codicibus, et primis editionibus Versionis Syriacæ Novi Testamenti Epistola secunda et tertia Joannis, et posterior Petri, et Judæ illa etiamnum desideratur.³ Dionysius Barsalibæus, apud Pocockium Præf. ad Epistolas Judæ, 2 Petri, 2 et 3 Joannis, monet, Epistolas hæc non fuisse versas in linguam Syriam, cum libris, qui diebus antiquis redditi sunt, ideoque non inveniri, nisi in versione Thomæ Episcopi Heraclænsis. Hinc apud Jacobum Edessenum in Onomastico tres tantum Catholicæ, non secus atque hic in Catalogo Sobenis, enumerantur: nimirum Jacobi, Petri, et Joannis, ut recensui. T. ii. Bib. Or. p. 499. Asseman. ib. p. 9, 10.

² Jacobi Episcopi Edesseni Vocum Difficiliorum, quæ in Syriaca Veteris ac Novi Testamenti Versione occurrunt, recensio et punctatio: nimirum Genesis, Exodi, — Actuum Apostolorum, Epistolæ Jacobi, Petri, Joannis, Epistolarum xiv. Pauli, Evangelii Matthæi, Marci, Lucæ, Joannis. Ap. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. ii. p. 499.

³ Apocalypsin Joannis nec Sobenis recensuit, nec Barhebræus aut Jacobus Edessenus exposuere, duabus de causis: vel quia ab ipsis inter libros canoni-

cos minime admissa fuit: vel, quod verosimilius censeo, quia ea in Syriaca Simpliciter vocant Scripturæ Versione haud exstabat. Cæterum Apocalypsin tamquam canonicum librum a S. Ephræmo agnitam fuisse liquet ex ejus carmine in illud Psalmi — de quo dixi Tom. i. p. 141. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 8.

² Quod ideo notavi, ut constaret Syrorum antiquissimorum de illius libri auctoritate judicium contra Hebedjesu, qui in Catalogo manuscripto inter libros canonicos Apocalypsin non nominat. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 141.

³ De Apocalypsi Joannis dubitatum olim fuit, an inter canonicos libros esset: maxime apud Orientales ecclesias, teste Junilio Africano. Dubitasse videtur et Barhebræus in suo Nomocanone cap. 7. sect. 9. ubi hanc Dionysii Alexandrini sententiam refert: 'Apocalypsis, quæ nomine Joannis Apostoli prænotatur, non ejus est, sed vel Cerinthi, qui cibum et potum similiter super terram post resurrectionem docet: vel Joannis cujuspiam alterius. Duo enim sunt Ephesi monumenta, quæ hoc nomine noscuntur.' Certe Syri, tum Jacobitæ tum Nestoriani, lectionem nullam ex Apocalypsi in ecclesia recitant: et tam in manuscriptis Syriacis T. N. codicibus, quam in eo Exemplari, quod, Mose Mardeno Ignatii Jacobitarum Patriarchæ Oratore procurante, a Joanne Alberto Wido mansladio Viennæ Anno Christi 1555, typis editum fuit, Apocalypsis desideratur. — Cæterum Ægyptii eam constanter ad-

version;

version, which they call Simple; and that none of the Syrians have any readings out of this book in their public lessons; and that Gregory Barhebræus seems to doubt of its genuineness, and to approve of the sentiment of Dionysius of Alexandria. However, he says, that the Egyptian Christians in general receive the book of the Revelation as canonical, without hesitation.

7. I would now make another remark upon this part of Ebedjesu's Catalogue. Whatever was the general opinion of the Syrians, concerning the four catholic epistles, which have been doubted of by some, and concerning the book of the Revelation; I think, that Ebedjesu should not have passed them by in total silence: he could not be unacquainted with them. In the following part of his Catalogue, among the works of Hippolytus, he particularly mentions his vindication of John the apostle's Revelation. The passage of Ebedjesu was formerly quoted by us^o in the chapter of Hippolytus. I would now add from the works of Ephrem since published, that James bishop of Edessa, in a passage referred to some while ago^p, mentions^q that book of Hippolytus, which he calls a commentary upon the Revelation, or an explication of it; which seems to shew, that this work of Hippolytus was well known to learned Syrians; consequently, the book of the Revelation could not be unknown, nor very obscure among them. Though those epistles, and this book, were not in the ancient Syriac version; yet, very probably, they were in the Syriac language, in some other translation. Supposing this to be the case, I think, Ebedjesu was obliged to mention them: if they were not equally respected with the other books of the New Testament, he might have said so. He might have made two sorts or divisions of sacred books; some universally received, and respected as divine and canonical, and others, which were not of that high authority, and about which some had doubts.

8. However, we here plainly see what are the books of scripture, which are generally received by the Syrian Chris-

mittunt, ut ex canone Alulbareati liquet: eandemque doctis Commentariis illustravit Benassalius, quorum exemplar Arabicum exstat in Bibliotheca Collegii Maronitarum de Urbe. Id. T. iii. p. 15, 16.

^o Vol. ii. p. 412. note rr.

^p See here p. 432. r.

^q Hanc porro mulierem, [Vid. Apoc. xvii. 3—6.] id est, gentem rerum dominam, vestiam bestia, id est, orbis imperium obtinentem,

invadet coluber Antichristus, seducet et perdet. Jam illud imperium ad eos pertinere, qui Latini dicuntur, Spiritus in sanctis viris inhabitans declaravit, et docuit per Hippolytum Episcopum et Martyrem in eo libro, quo Joannis Theologi Apocalypsim interpretatur. Jacob. Edessen. in Jacobi de Antichristo in Benedictione Dan Vaticinium. Ap. S. Ephrem. Comm. in Gen. T. Syr. i. p. 192.

SIANS.

tians. And we are much obliged to Dr. Joseph Asseman for giving us the Catalogue of Ebedjesu, as he found it in the manuscript: which another editor of that Catalogue did not do, but of his own head added the epistle of 'Jude and the 'Revelation. He also struck out the word three, saying, instead of three epistles, the epistles, that is, of James, Peter, John, and Jude, which are called catholic: for which he has been justly censured by 'that honest man, and excellent writer, the late Isaac Beaufobre.

9. They who are desirous to inform themselves concerning the Syriac version or versions of the New Testament, may consult, beside ^u others, ^x Fabricius, ^y Asseman, and ^z Wetstein.

C H A P. CIV.

PACIAN, BISHOP OF BARCELONA,

1. PACIAN, bishop of Barcelona, is in Jerom's Catalogue. I place the chapter ^a below. He flourished about the year 370, and died an old man before 390.

^r Tres Epistolae.] Jacobi scilicet, Petri, et Joannis. Ita habet Sobensis in manuscripto nostro codice. At Echellenfis in Catalogo impresso p. 8. et 9. hunc locum sic edidit: 'Epistolae consignatae ab Aposto-
'lis omni charactere et lingua: nempe Ja-
'cobo, Petro, Joanne et Juda: et ideo
'catholicae vocantur.' Ubi nomen Judae, ut mihi videtur, de suo adjiciens, vocem illam, 'tres epistolae,' in hanc, 'Epistolae,' mutavit, contra metri Syriaci rationem, et contra ipsius Sobensis mentem, qui ex communi Syrorum sententia tres tantum canonicas epistolas recenset, quarum scilicet de auctoritate Syri numquam dubitarunt, quæque ab initio inter canonicos libros in Syriaca Versione Simplici collocatae sunt. [Vid. reliqua supr. p. 441. not. 1.] Al-
fem. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 9. notis.

^s Echellenfis p. 15. post Epistolam Pauli ad Hebraeos hæc verba de Joannis Apocalypsi addit, quæ in textu Sobensis desiderantur: 'Revelatio Joannis Græce scripta
'est in insula Patmi.' Præter argumenta, quæ supra adduxi, vel ipsa metri heptasyllabi ratio, quæ hic nulla est, hanc appendiculam e genuino Sobensis Catalogo exclu-
dit. Id. ib. p. 10. in notis.

^t Aussi Ebedjesu n' a-t-il mis dans son Catalogue, ni les quatre autres Epîtres, ni l'Apocalypse. Mais Abraham Echellenfis, qui avoit publié ce Catalogue avant M. Asseman, n' a pas fait difficulté d' y ajouter l' Epître de S. Jude, et de mettre, après l' article des Epîtres de S. Paul: 'la
'Revelation de S. Jean a été écrite en
'Grec dans l' isle de Patmos.' C'est un échantillon remarquable de la mauvaise foi de ce Maronite. &c. Hist. de Manich.
T. i. p. 295.

^u Edw. Pocock's Preface to his Commentary upon the Prophecy of Micah, and elsewhere. Br. Walton. Prolegom. ap. Bibl. Polyglott. n. xiii. De Lingua Syriaca et Scripturae Versionibus Syriacis. Fr. Spanh. T. i. p. 650. Fr. Ad. Lamp. Prolegom. ad Joan. l. i. c. 4. ver. 7. Jer. Jones on the Canon of the N. T. Vol. i. p. 105—144. ^x Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. iii. p. 201, 202. T. v. p. 320, 321.

^y Asseman. Bib. Or. T. ii. c. xiii. De Tho. Heracl. p. 90—94. Vid. ib. cap. x. p. 82, 83. et p. 23. et p. 307. b. et alibi.

^z J. J. Wetsten. Prolegom. ad N. T. Gr. edit. accurat. cap. ix. et Prolegom. ad N. T. Gr. p. 109, 112.

^a Pacianus, in Pyrenæi jugis Barcelona.

2. Pacian

2. Pacian had a son named Flavius Dexter, to whom Jerom inscribed his Catalogue, at whose request it was composed. Dexter was in several high offices of the empire, and for a time præfect of the prætorium. He had also a place in Jerom's Catalogue, as an ecclesiastical writer: though the work mentioned by Jerom is not universally allowed to be now extant.

3. Jerom says, that Pacian wrote several small tracts, particularly against the Novatians. And we still have his three letters to Sympronian, a Novatian, and an Exhortation to Repentance, and a Discourse of Baptism: but the genuineness of this last is not very manifest. Pacian was quoted by us formerly in the history of the Novatians: for a more particular account of him and his writings I refer to others.

4. I observe only, as suited to my present design, that Pacian has several times quoted the book of Canticles, and the commonly received books of the New Testament, particularly the Acts of the apostles, and also the book of the Revelation. But I do not see any quotation of the epistle to the Hebrews, nor any plain reference to it, though it be sometimes put in the margin by the editor.

CHAP. CV.

OPTATUS OF MILEVI.

I. SAYS Jerom: 'Optatus' of Africa, bishop of Milevi, in the time of the emperors Valentinian and Valens, wrote a work in six books in defence of the catholics against the Donatists.'

episcopus, castitate et eloquentia, et tam vita quam sermone clarus, scripsit varia opuscula, de quibus et Cervus, et contra Novatianos. Sub Theodosio Principe jam ultima senectute mortuus est. De V. I. cap. 106.

^b Hórtaris, Dexter, ut Tranquillum sequens Ecclesiasticos Scriptores in ordinem digeram, et quod ille in enumerandis Gentilium literarum viris fecit illustribus, ego in nostris faciam. Prol. in libr. de V. I.

Unde etiam ante annos ferme decem, quum Dexter amicus meus, qui Præfecturam administravit Prætorii, me rogasset, ut auctorum nostræ religionis ei indicem texerem: &c. Adv. Ruf. l.iii. T. iv. p. 419. m.

^c Dexter Paciani (de quo supra dixi) filius, clarus apud sæculum, et Christi fidei deditus, fertur ad me omnimodam historiam texuisse, quam necdum legi. De V. I. cap. 139.

^d Ap. B. P. P.

T. iv. p. 305—319. ^e Vol. iii. p. 219.

^f Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. Fabr. ad Hieron. de V. I. cap. 106. et Bib. Lat. Vol. iii. p. 428. Du Pin. Bib. T. ii. p. 101. Tillem. Mem. T. viii. p. 537, et seq.

^a Optatus Afer, episcopus Milevitanus, ex parte Catholica, scripsit, Valentiniano et Valente Principibus, adversus Donatianæ partis calumniam libro sex: in quibus asserit, crimen Donatianum in nos falso retorqueri. De V. I. cap. 110.

2. The

2. The city of Milevi was situated in Numidia. Jerom says, that Optatus wrote under the emperors Valentinian and Valens, that is, between 364 and 375; from which, and from some other considerations, Tillemont concludes, that his work was published about the year 370: which is little different from Cave, who placeth this writer at 368. For a particular account of Optatus, and his work, I refer to several^b moderns.

3. Divers testimonies to him in ancient writers may be seen prefixed to his works, and are taken notice of by Tillemont at the beginning of his article concerning him. I add to that already taken from Jerom, one from Augustine, where^c he reckons Optatus with Cyprian, and others, who had come over from Gentilism to Christianity, and had brought with them the riches of the Egyptians, that is, learning and eloquence, to the no small advantage of the Christian interests.

4. Beside many other books of the Old Testament, Optatus has quoted^d the Canticles several times; he once^e quotes the book of Wisdom, as Solomon's: he has also quoted^f Tobit, and^g Ecclesiasticus.

5. In the New Testament, beside the gospels, he has quoted the^h book of the Acts, and several of St. Paul's epistles, andⁱ the first and^k second epistle of St. John.

6. Jerom computed the works of Optatus to consist of six books; whereas we now have seven. Concerning this difficulty may be seen the authors, to whom I have already referred.

7. There is a passage, which has been supposed a part of the seventh book; which some^l have alleged, as a proof, that Optatus received the epistle to the Hebrews. But supposing the passage to be genuine, it is of no importance; it appearing plainly, that^m Optatus quotes not an apostle but a prophet,

^b Cav. H. Lit. T. i. p. 234. S. Baf. nag. Ann. 368. n. ix. Du Pin Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 109—122. et Pref. ad Optat. Fleury's Ec. Hist. B. 16. ch. xl. Tillemont Les Donatistes. Art. 58. Mem. T. vi. Fabr. Bib. Ec. ad Hieron. De V. l. cap. 110. et Bib. Lat. T. iii. p. 495.

^c Nonne adspicimus, quanto auro et argento et veste suffarcinatus exierit de Aegypto Cyprianus doctor suavissimus, et martyr beatissimus? quanto Lactantius? quanto Victorinus, Optatus, Hilarius? Ut de vivis taceam. Quanto innumerabiles Græci? De Doctr. Christian. l. ii. cap. 40. n. 61. T. iii.

^d Optat. l. i. cap. 10. bis. l. ii. cap. 8. l. iii. cap. 3. l. iv. cap. 6.

^e Cum scriptum sit in Salomone: Deus mortem non fecit, nec latetur in perditionis viarum. Sap. i. 13. l. ii. c. 25.

^f — qui in lectione Patriarchæ Tobie legitur in Tigride flumine prehensus. l. iii. c. 2.

^g L. iii. c. 3. bis. ^h L. v. cap. 5. ⁱ L. i. c. 15. l. ii. c. 19. l. vii. c. 2.

^k Ignorantes, de quibus Apostolus hoc dixerit: Cum his nec cibum capere: Ave illi ne dixeritis. [1 Cor. v. 11. et 2 Joh. 10.] L. iv. cap. 5. ^l Baron. Ann. 60. n. L. Fr. Spanhem. de Auctor. Ep. ad Hebr. l. ii. cap. 7. n. viii. T. ii. p. 201.

^m — legem indicavit Deus per Prophetam dicens: Quoniam hoc est testamentum meum, quod disponam domui Israel et domui Jude. Et post dies illos dicit Dominus, dans leges meas in corde eorum, et in mentibus eorum scribam eas. Promisit hoc jamdudum, et proxime reddidit temporibus Christianis. Optat. l. vii. p. 108. edit. Du Pin.

and intends not Heb. viii. 8—11, but Jer. xxxi. 31—33; as has been fully shewn by my highly esteemed friend, the late Mr. Joseph Hallett, in his Introduction^a to the epistle to the Hebrews, in English; or his Dissertation concerning the author and language of that epistle, as translated into Latin, and inserted by the learned J. C. Wolfius in the fourth tome of his *Curæ*^o upon the New Testament. So that there is no proof, that Optatus received the epistle to the Hebrews. However, as this work is not very long, and Optatus does not abound with quotations of texts of scripture; we cannot say certainly, what books were received by him, and what not. We need make no doubt, but he received all such as were generally received by other Christians in Africa, in his time.

8. I need not produce here any proofs of his respect for the sacred scriptures of the Old and New Testament, about which there can be no question. And besides, some passages of his to this purpose were alleged formerly, in the chapters^r concerning the burning the scriptures in the time of Dioclesian's persecution, and^s the history of the Donatists.

9. Remarks upon Optatus's performance may be seen in^t James Basnage's *History of the Church*.

10. Le Clerc in his preface to Kuster's edition of Mill's *New Testament*, has observed several of this author's quotations of texts, which Mill had taken no notice of in his collations of ancient writers. I shall put down here only one of them.

11. Luke ix. 50. *And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us.* So in our copies: but Optatus^u reads, *For he who is not against you, is for you.* Which is also found in divers other authors, and in divers manuscripts and versions, as observed by Le Clerc, and also by Mill, Bengelius, and Mr. Wetstein upon the place. Moreover this reading is approved by^v Mill and^w Bengelius.

12. I shall add another text, not mentioned by Le Clerc, because he aimed at those quotations of Optatus, which had been omitted by Mill.

Rom. xii. 13. *Distributing to the necessity of saints.* Optatus instead^x of *necessity*, or *necessities*, has *memories*. Du Pin in his notes upon that place of his author says, that^y Optatus

^a p. 18, 19.

^o T. iv. 820, 821.

^p See before, p. 88, 89.

^q lb.

p. 101.

^r Hist. de d' Eglise, p. 185,

186.

^s Sic Christus ait: Nolite prohibere. *Qui enim non est contra vos, pro vobis est.* L. v. c. 7.

^t Prolegom. n. 996.

^u In loc.

^x Contra Apostolum facientes, qui ait:

Memorii sanctorum communicantes. L. ii. c. 4.
^y Attamen de necessitatibus et indigentia sanctorum, hoc est, Christianorum, intelligendum esse Apostolum, longe verissimilius est. Sed excusandus Optatus, qui communem suo tempore lectionem secutus est. Du Pin in loc. p. 33.

followed a reading which was common in his time, but thinks, *necessities* to be the true reading. On the contrary, Mill thinks *memories* to be right. He gives a good sense of the text, according to that reading: 'That^a we are here directed to remember with compassion poor and afflicted Christians at a distance, and to relieve them.' He also alleges many authorities for that reading: but in my opinion, the passage of Clement of Rome, upon^a which he relies very much, is far from being clear to his purpose. Bengelius^b thinks it of no value. Concerning this reading may be consulted the just mentioned learned writer, and Wolfius.

CHAPTER CVI.

AMBROSE, BISHOP OF MILAN.

I. *His time and history.* II. and III. *Scriptures of the Old and New Testament received by him.* IV. *Respect for them.* V. *General titles and divisions.* VI. *Select passages.*

I. AMBROSE, born, as some think, about 333, or rather, as others, about 340, and made bishop of Milan in 374, died in 397. For a more particular account of him, and his writings, with their character, I refer to^a others.

2. Ambrose was living when Jerom wrote his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers in 392; for^{bb} which reason he declined giving a distinct account of his works: nevertheless, upon divers occasions he has made mention of^c several of them, and takes notice of^d his frequently borrowing from Origen, without naming him.

^a Ut nempe per *μνησας* intelligantur necessitates sanctorum absentium. Mill. in loc. Conf. Prolegom. n. 142.

^b Vid. Proleg. n. 142.

^c Nil huc facit Clementis Romanis. Bengel. ad Rom. xii. 13.

^d Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. T. i. and Lives of the Fathers, in English. Vol. II. Du Pin Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. Tillem. Mem. T. x. Vit. S. Ambrosii a Benedictino. adornat. Pagi Ann. 369. xiii. 374. iii. et alibi. S. Basnag. Ann. 374. n. x. et alibi. Ja. Basnag. Hist. de l'Eglise l. xix. ch. 4. n. ix. p. 1171. Beau-

sobre Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 366. not. i.

^{bb} Ambrosius Mediolanensis episcopus, usque in presentem diem scribit. De quo, quia superest, meum judicium subtraham, ne in alterutram partem, aut adulatio in me reprehendatur, aut veritas. De V. I. c. 124.

^c Ad Eustoch. ep. 18. al. 22. T. 4. P. ii. p. 37. Ad Damas. Pap. ep. 14. al. 17. p. 20. et ep. 30. al. 50. p. 237, 238. 240. f. Vid. et ad Algal. Qu. vi. T. iv. P. ii. p. 198. in. al. ep. 151.

^d Nuper sanctus Ambrosius sic Hexæmeron illius compilavit, ut magis Hippolyti sententias Basilique sequeretur. Ad Pamm.

3. Beside Basil, partly contemporary with him, and some other Greek writers, Tillemont says, he ^e must also have read the works of ancient heretics; for ^f he quotes the 38th tome of Apelles, disciple of Marcion.

4. The eminence of this bishop of Milan, and the share he had in the public transactions of his time, have secured him a place ^g in the Greek ecclesiastical historians: not to insist on Paulinus, Rufinus, Augustine, and others among the Latins.

II. 1. Ambrose quotes much the generally received books of the Old Testament, particularly the ^h book of Ruth, and the ⁱ Canticles: which last he quotes very often and explains largely.

2. He ^k ascribes to Solomon three books only, the Proverbs, the Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles.

3. He likewise quotes often the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, as ^l Baruch, Tobit, the Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, the ^m fourth book of Esdras, and sometimes with marks of great respect.

4. He speaks of the book of Tobit, as ⁿ a prophetic book; and in like manner of ^o the book of Wisdom, and ^p Ecclesiasticus. The last-mentioned book he has quoted as ^q a part of the divine oracles. He quotes it also as ^r of authority, or by way of proof.

et Ocean. ep. 41. al. 65. T. iv. p. 346.

Habuit Ambrosium, cujus pene omnes libri hujus sermonibus pleni sunt. Adv. Ruf. l. i. p. 351. fin.

Nemo tibi objicit, quare Origenem interpretatus es: alioqui Hilarius et Ambrosius hoc crimine tenebuntur: sed quia interpretatus hæretica, præfationis tuæ laude firmasti. Ibid. l. ii. p. 305. in.

^e St. Ambroise. art. 10. T. x.

^f Plerique enim, quorum auctor Apelles, sicut habes in trigésimo et octavo tomo ejus, has quæstiones proponunt. De Parad. cap. vi. T. i. p. 155. F.

^g Vid. Socr. l. iv. c. 30. Soz. l. vii. c. 25. Thrt. l. iv. c. 7. l. 5. c. 18.

^h In Luc. l. iii. T. i. p. 1326. ter quaterve. Et passim.

ⁱ Unde et Salomon oraculum divinum secutus scripsit in Canticis Canticorum. In Pf. 118. T. i. p. 986. C. Et passim.

^k Unde et Salomonis tres libri ex plurimis videntur electi: Ecclesiastes de naturalibus, Cantica Canticorum de mysticis, Proverbia de moralibus. In Pf. 36. Pr. T. i. p. 777.

Quid etiam tres libri Salomonis, unus de Proverbiis, alius Ecclesiastes, tertius de Canticis Canticorum, nisi trina hujus of-

tendunt nobis sapientiæ sanctum Salomonem fuisse solertem? In Lucam. Pr. T. i. p. 1262. A.

^l In Pf. 43. T. i. p. 901. In Pf. 118. p. 1194. E.

^m Si hinc faciunt quæstionem, quod creatum Spiritum dixit, quia creatur Spiritus Esdras docuit, dicens in quarto libro: *Et in die secundo iterum creasti spiritum firmamenti.* [4 Esdr. vi. 41.] De Sp. S. l. iii. c. vi. T. ii. p. 643. C. D.

ⁿ Lecto prophetico libro, qui inscribitur Tobias. &c. De Tobia cap. i. T. i. p. 591. B.

^o Prophetæ dicunt: In lumine tuo videbimus lumen. [Pf. xxxv. 10. al. xxxvi. 9.] Prophetæ dicunt: *Splendor est enim lucis æterna, et speculum sine macula Dei majestatis, et imago bonitatis illius.* [Sap. vii. 26.] De Fide, l. i. c. 7.

^p Prophetia dicit: *Et tu cum consilio omnia fac.* [Ecclef. xxxii. 19.] In Pf. xxxvi. T. i. p. 808. C.

^q Proprietatis autem generationem esse, oracula divina declarant. Dicit enim Sapientia Dei: *Ex ore Altissimi prodixi.* [Ecclef. xxiv. 3.] De Fide, l. iv. c. 8. T. ii. p. 537. A.

^r — testimoniis Scripturarum docemur. Siquidem lectum est. [Ecclef. ii. 5.] In Pf. cxviii. T. i. p. 1224. E.

5. Once at least, if not oftener, he has quoted ' the book of Ecclesiasticus as Solomon's; though, as before shewn, he ascribed no more than three books to Solomon. Moreover, in other places ' he ascribes the book of Ecclesiasticus to Sirach. Why ' he there calls it Solomon's, is not certain; whether because it was so called by many, or that he supposed Sirach's collection to consist very much of thoughts and observations of king Solomon.

6. He has likewise quoted * the book of Wisdom, as Solomon's, without thinking it to be really his; but, probably, in compliance with a common way of speaking, as it was called Solomon's Wisdom by ' many, the vulgar sort of people, especially.

7. However, from particulars just taken notice of, it appears, that Ambrose has quoted the apocryphal books of the Old Testament with tokens of great respect.

III. 1. I formerly * transcribed and translated Origen's observations upon St. Luke's preface, or introduction to his gospel, both the Greek and the Latin. And I then said, that Ambrose had the like observations in his explication of the beginning of St. Luke's gospel. I do not intend to translate him, but I shall transcribe below * the passage very much at

* Pulchre autem istud exposuit nobis Solomon, dicens: *Narratio iusti semper iustitia. Stultus autem sicut luna mutatur.* [Ecclef. 27. 11.] In Pf. xxxvi. p. 807. E.

* Considera illum; de quo ait in Ecclesiastico Sirach. De interpell. Job, l. i. c. iii. T. i. p. 627. E.

Nam et alibi dixit Sirach Sapientia. In Pf. cxviii. p. 1135.

* Vid. ib. a Benedictinis annotata. p. 807.

* Quid sit scientia, doceat te Salomon, qui ait de Domino nostro: *Ipse enim mihi dedit eorum quæ sunt cognitionem veram.* [Sap. vii. 17.] In Pf. cxviii. p. 1082. D.

* Alii vero duo [libri] quorum unus Sapientia, alter Ecclesiasticus dicitur, propter eloquii nonnullam similitudinem, ut Salomonis dicantur, obtinuit consuetudo. Non autem esse ipsius, non dubitant doctiores. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. vii. c. 20.

* Vol. ii. p. 502—504.

* Nam sicut multi in illo populo divino infusi spiritu prophetarunt: alii vero prophetare se pollicebantur, et professionem destituebant mendacio: (erant enim pseudo-prophetae: potius quam Prophetæ; sicut Ananias filius Azor,) erat autem populi gratia discernere spiritus, ut cognosceret quos recte deberet in numerum Prophetarum:

quos autem quasi bonus nummularius improbare, in quibus materia magis corrupta forderet, quam veri splendor luminis resplenderet: sic et nunc in Novo Testamento multi Evangelia scribere conati sunt, quæ boni nummularii non probarunt. Unum autem tantummodo in quatuor libros digestum ex omnibus arbitrati sunt eligendum. Et aliud quidem fertur Evangelium, quod duodecim scripsisse dicuntur. Ausus est etiam Basilides Evangelium scribere, quod dicitur secundum Basilidem. Fertur etiam aliud Evangelium, quod scribitur secundum Thomam. Novi aliud scriptum secundum Matthiam. Legimus aliqua, ne legantur. Legimus, ne ignoremus. Legimus, non ut teneamus, sed ut repudiemus: et ut sciamus, qualia sint, in quibus magnifici isti cor exaltant suum. Sed Ecclesia, cum quatuor Evangelii libros habeat, per universum mundum Evangelistis redundat. Hæreses, cum multa habeant, unum non habent. — *Quoniam multi, inquit, conati sunt.* Conati utique illi sunt, qui implere nequiverunt. Ergo multos cepisse, nec implevisse, etiam sanctus Lucas testimonio locupletiore testatur, dicens, *plurimos esse conatos* — Non conatus est Matthæus, non conatus est Marcus, non conatus est Johannes, non

large, that they who are curious may with the greater ease compare all together.

2. St. Ambrose's style is somewhat more prolix and verbose; but I suppose, none can doubt, that he here copied Origen, though he does not mention him: a proceeding, that can very seldom be warrantable in authors; and in this instance it appears not a little strange.

3. However, it is fit we should observe, that Ambrose rejects the gospel according to the Twelve, the gospels according to Basilides, according to Thomas, and according to Matthias. And says, that the church had one gospel in four books, spread all over the world, and written by Matthew, Mark, John and Luke, with the assistance of the Spirit of God.

4. He elsewhere likewise says, that ^b there is one gospel, and four books.

5. In the prologue to his Exposition of St. Luke's gospel, he mentions ^c the symbols of the evangelists, as supposed to be represented by the four living creatures in Rev. iv. 7.

6. In the same prologue, like many others, Ambrose ^d admires the transcendent sublimity of the beginning of St. John's gospel: and on that account seems to give him the preference above the other three evangelists; though he ascribes also great wisdom to each one of them. In another place he says, that ^e the beginning of St. John's gospel confuted all heresies, particularly Arianism, Sabellianism, and Manichæism.

7. It is said, that ^f Ambrose is the first Latin who wrote a commentary upon St. Luke's gospel: and it is supposed to have been written in the year 386. R. Simon ^g has made remarks upon it.

conatus est Lucas: sed divino spiritu ubertatem dictorum rerumque omnium ministrante, sine ullo molimine complerunt. *Expos. Ev. Luc. T. i. p. 1265, 1266.*

^b Sed etiam Evangelium unum est, et quatuor libros esse, negare non possumus. *In Ps. xl. T. i. p. 88g. B.*

^c Unde etiam ii qui quatuor animalium formas quæ in Apocalypsi revelantur, quatuor Evangelii libros intelligendos arbitrati sunt, hunc librum volunt vituli specie figurari. — Et congruit vitulo hic Evangelii liber, qui a sacerdotibus inchoavit. — Plerique tamen putant, ipsum Dominum nostrum in quatuor Evangelii libris quatuor formis animalium figurari, quod idem homo, idem Ico, idem vitulus, idem aquila comprobatur. *Prolog. in Expos. Luc. n. 7, 8. p. 1264.*

^d Est enim vere sapientia naturalis in libro Evangelistæ [an Evan-

gelii?] secundum Joannem. Nemo enim, audeo dicere, tanta sublimitate sapientiæ majestatem Dei vidit, et nobis proprio sermone referavit. Transcendit nubes, transcendit virtutes cælorum, transcendit angelos, et Verbum apud Deum vidit. Quis autem moralis secundum hominem singula persecutus, quam sanctus Matthæus, qui edidit nobis præcepta vivendi? Quid rationabilius illo admirabili copulato, quam quod sanctus Marcus in principio statim locandum putavit? &c. *Ibid. p. 1262, 1263.*

^e Omnes autem hæreses hoc capitulo brevi piscator noster exclusit. *De Fide. l. i. c. 8. p. 454. T. ii.*

^f — quod apud Latinos ipsius tantum, et non alterius in Lucam commentarius fertur. *Rufin. Invektiv. in Hieron. ap. Hieron. T. iv. p. 432.*

^g *Hist. Crit. des Commentateurs du N. T. ch. 14. p. 206—209.*

8. The

8. The book of the Acts of the apostles is very often quoted by St. Ambrose, and not seldom^h by that title at length: and itⁱ is ascribed by him to St. Luke.

9. He supposes^k St. Luke to be *the brother*, intended by St. Paul, 2 Cor. viii. 18. *whose praise is in the gospel, throughout all the churches.*

10. This Italian bishop received fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul: concerning which I need not add any thing farther in particular, than that^l he has quoted the epistle to the Ephesians expressly with that inscription; and^m that he often quotes the epistle to the Hebrews, as Paul's, without hesitation.

11. He frequently quotes the first epistle of Peter, and the first epistle of John; and sometimes asⁿ if they were the only epistles of those apostles. Nevertheless, he has also quoted^o the second epistle of Peter.

12. In the Benedictine edition of St. Ambrose's works is put a reference to the 7th verse of St. John's second epistle: but the^p quotation, I think, better suits the words of 1 John iv. 3.

13. Mill, for proving that Ambrose received the epistle of St. James, quotes^q a book, not^r generally allowed to be his. There is supposed to be a reference^{qq} to James i. 14. in an acknowledged work.

^h Ut legimus in Actibus Apostolorum. In Pf. xl. n. 37. T. i. p. 882.

ⁱ Et adversum Apostolos in Actibus eorum, quod seniores Israel convenerunt, Petrus sanctus, et Lucas Evangelista testantur. [Cap. iv. 1. & seqq.] In Pf. cxviii. n. 14. p. 1135.

^k Denique etiam a sancto apostolo Paulo testimonium meruit diligentiae. Sic enim laudat Lucam: *Cujus laus, inquit, est in evangelio per omnes ecclesias.* Expos. Ev. Luc. l. i. n. 11. p. 1269. E.

^l Sicut et Apostolus scribens ad Ephesios ait. De Sp. S. l. i. c. 6. T. ii. p. 616. C. D.

^m Ad Hebraeos scribens Apostolus dicit. De Sp. S. l. iii. c. 8. p. 674. F.

Apostoli illud exemplum est: non est meum. [Hebr. i. 3.] De Fide l. i. c. 13. T. ii. p. 460. A.

ⁿ Unde praeclare Petrus de Domino Jesu in epistola sua posuit. [1 Pet. ii. 23.] In Pf. xxxvii. n. 45. T. i. p. 835.

— quia caritas est Deus, ut dixit Joannes in epistola. In Pf. xxxviii. n. 10. p. 846.

Alibi quoque Joannes in epistola sua dicit. De Fide. l. i. c. 8. T. ii. p. 454. E.

Accipe tamen quid etiam scripserit Evangelista Joannes in epistola sua, dicens: [1 Jo. v. 20.] De Fide. l. i. c. 17. p. 467. A. B.

^o Et Petrus vult nos, ut legimus, divinae consortes fieri naturae. [2 Pet. i. 4.] De Fide. l. i. c. 19. T. ii. p. 469. C. Vide eund. loc. iterum citat. De Fide l. v. c. 14. p. 583. A. et de Sp. S. l. i. c. 6. p. 616. F.

Etiam Petrus sanctus adseruit, dicens: *Quapropter satagite, fratres, certam vestram vocationem et electionem facere.* &c. [2 Pet. i. 10, 11.] De Fide. l. iii. c. 12. p. 514. A.

^p Omnis qui negat Jesum Christum in carne venisse, de Deo non est. Expos. Ev. Luc. T. i. p. 1337. B.

^q Unde— Ambrosius Mediolani — Tract. de Mansionibus filiorum Israel, mansionē 18. epistolam Jacobi tamquam Apostoli citavit. Mill. Prolegom. n. 206.

^r Vid. Benedictin. Monitum. T. ii. in Append. p. 1, 2.

^{qq} Vinculis enim peccatorum suorum unusquisque constringitur, sicut ipse legitur. In Pf. cxviii. T. i. p. 1071. B. Vid. Jac. i. 14.

14. He expressly quotes the epistle of ^r Jude.

15. I suppose it cannot be doubted, that he received all the catholic epistles.

16. Ambrose very often quotes the book of the Revelation, and ascribes it ^a to John the apostle and evangelist.

17. Upon the whole, we see, that this celebrated bishop of Milan, in the latter part of the fourth century, received all the books of the New Testament, which we receive, without any other. For there appears not in his works any particular regard to writings of Barnabas, or Clement, or Ignatius, or to the Recognitions, or Constitutions. From whence we may reasonably conclude, that these just-mentioned writings were not esteemed of authority by himself, or other Christians at that time.

IV. His respect for the sacred scriptures is manifest. Ambrose was called to the episcopate from a secular course of life. For which reason he begs of God, to ^a give him application and necessary care to understand the scriptures. He ^b proves what he advances by texts of scripture, and does not otherwise expect to be regarded. And ^c he supposeth it to have been the practice of Christians in ancient times, to form their belief by the holy scriptures. Ambrose ^d was a great admirer of the Psalms, upon divers of which he wrote commentaries, particularly upon the 119th Psalm, which are generally well esteemed.

V. Divisions of scripture found in him are such as these: prophets ^e and apostles, Old and New Testament: the ^f prophetic and evangelical scriptures: the ^g law and the prophets,

^r — cui dictum est ab angelo Michaële in epistola Judæ: *Imperet tibi Dominus.* [ver. 9.] Exp. Ev. Luc. T. i. p. 1393. D.

^a Et ideo fortassis Joanni Evangelistæ cælum apertum, et albus equus est demonstratus. [Ap. xix. 12—16.] In Pf. xl. p. 878. A.

Quomodo igitur ascendamus ad cælum, docet Evangelista, qui dicit. — [Apoc. xxi. 10.] De Virginitat. cap. 14. T. ii. p. 234. D.

^b Sed tantummodo intentionem et diligentiam circa scripturas divinas opto adsequi. De Offic. Ministr. l. i. c. 1. T. i. p. 3.

^c Sed nolo argumento credas, sancte Imperator, et nostræ disputationi. Scripturas interrogemus. Interrogemus Apostolos, interrogemus Prophetas, interrogemus Christum. De Fide. l. i. c. 6. T. ii. p. 451. C.

Satis, ut arbitror, libro superiore, sancte Imperator, — Scripturarum lectionibus approbavimus. De Fide. l. ii. Prolog. p. 471. B.

^d Sic nempe nostri secundum Scripturas dixerunt patres. De Fide. l. i. c. 18. p. 467. C.

^e Etenim licet omnis Scriptura divina Dei gratiam spiret, precipue tamen dulcis Psalmorum liber. In Pf. i. Præf. n. iv. T. i. p. 738.

^f Clamat Propheta sempiternum, clamat et Apostolus sempiternum. Plenum est Vetus Testamentum testimoniis Filii sempiterni, plenum est Novum. De Fide. l. i. c. 8. T. ii. p. 454. C.

^g In quo nobis Prophetice Scripturæ et Evangelicæ suffragantur. Expof. Luc. l. i. p. 1277. F.

^h Lex et Prophetæ cum Evangelio congruentes. De Fide. l. i. c. 13. p. 465. D.

agreeing with the gospel: the * gospel, the apostle, and the prophets.

VI. There are some other things in Ambrose, which may be reckoned worthy of notice.

1. He quotes ^d Mark xvi. 15. Therefore he had in his copies the latter part of that chapter.

2. Ambrose * had in his copies the passage concerning the adulterous woman, which we now have in the 8th chapter of St. John's gospel.

3. He quotes 2 Tim. i. 14. after this manner: *That good thing, which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost, which is given to us.*

4. He * seems not to have had the heavenly witnesses, in his copies of the fifth chapter of St. John's first epistle.

5. He ^h speaks of various readings in the Latin copies of the New Testament: some of which likewise, he says, had been corrupted; and he appeals to the original Greek.

C H A P. CVII.

THE PRISCILLIANISTS.

I. *Jerom's chapter of Priscillian.* II. III. *Two chapters more of Jerom concerning Latronian and Tiberian, followers of Priscillian.* IV. *A chapter of Isidore of Seville concerning Idacius, one of Priscillian's accusers.* V. *The time of the rise of Priscillianism.* VI. *The history of Priscillian, and of his prosecution and execution at Treves, together with divers of his friends and followers, extracted from Sulpicius Severus.* VII. *An apology for Priscillian and his friends, in divers remarks upon that extract.* VIII.

^c Cum igitur in Evangelio, in Apostolo, in Prophetis generationem Christi legerimus. De Fide. l. i. c. 14. p. 462. D.

^d Audivimus enim legi, dicente Domino: Ite in orbem universum, et predicate evangelium universæ creaturæ. De Fide. l. i. c. 14. p. 461. D. ^e Vid. ep. 25. et 26. T. ii. p. 892—894.

^f Bonum depositum custodi per Spiritum Sanctum, qui datus est nobis. Exp. Ev. Luc. l. i. T. i. p. 1270. A.

^g Et ideo hi tres testes unum sunt, sicut Joannes dicit: *Aqua, sanguis, et Spiritus.* Unum in mysterio, non in natura. Aqua igitur est testis sepulture, Sanguis testis est mortis, Spiritus testis est vitæ. De Sp. S.

l. i. T. ii. c. 6. p. 616. &c.

Alibi quoque Evangelista: *Per aquam, inquit, et Spiritum venit Christus Jesus, non solum in aqua, sed per aquam et sanguinem. Et Spiritus testimonium dicit, quoniam Spiritus est veritas: quia tres sunt testes, Spiritus, aqua, sanguinis. Et hi tres unum sunt.* De Sp. S. l. iii. c. x. al. xi. p. 678. D.

^h Quod si quis de Latinorum codicum varietate contendit, quorum aliquos perfidi falsaverunt, Græcos inspiciat codices, et advertat, quia ibi scriptum est: *Ο Πνευμαλι Θου πιστευομεν.* Quod interpretatur Latinus: *Qui Spiritui Dei servimus.* De Sp. S. l. ii. c. x. p. 642. D. Conf. Mill. et Wolff. ad Philip. iii. 3.

The sentiments of the Priscillianists concerning the scriptures, and upon other points. IX. Charges of falsehood and lewdness brought against them by Jerom and Augustine considered. X. The like in pope Leo. XI. An article of Philaster in their favour. XII. The conclusion.

I. SAYS Jerom, 'Priscillian^a bishop of Abila, who by means of the faction of Hydatius and Ithacius was put to death at Treves, by order of the usurper Maximus, wrote many small pieces, some of which have reached us. To this day he is accused by some, as having been of the Gnostic heresy, holding the same principles with Basilides and Marcion, mentioned by Irenæus. Others defend him, saying, that he did not hold the opinions imputed to him.'

Jerom here says, that Priscillian had written many small pieces: and he seems to say, that he had seen some of them. I do not recollect any thing of them to be now extant, except some passages of an epistle of his, cited by Orofius in his Commonitorium, or Memoir, sent to Augustine: and they appear not a little obscure.

II. I must proceed to transcribe the two following chapters of Jerom's Catalogue, as nearly connected with the former, and because they will be of use to us hereafter.

'Latronian^b of Spain, a learned man, and for his poetical writings fit to be compared with the ancients, was also put to death at Treves, together with Priscillian, Felicissimus, Julian, and Euchrocia, leaders of the same faction. The monuments of his wit are still extant, written in divers kinds of metre.'

Jerom therefore must have seen likewise some of the works of Latronian, as well as of Priscillian, though none of them have come down to us.

III. 'Tiberian^c of Bætica, accused of the same heresy with Priscillian, wrote an apology for himself in a pompous and laboured style. Afterwards, when his friends had been put to death, weary of his exile, he changed his mind, and, to

^a Priscillianus Abilæ episcopus, qui factione Hydatii et Ithacii Treveris a Maximo tyranno cæsus est, edidit multa opuscula, de quibus ad nos aliqua pervenerunt. Hic usque hodie a nonnullis Gnosticæ, id est, Basilidis et Marcionis, de quibus Irenæus scripsit, hæreseos accusatur, defendentibus aliis, non eum ita sentisse, ut arguitur. De V. I. cap. 121.

^b Latronianus, provincie Hispaniæ, valde eruditus, et in metrico opere veteribus componendus, cæsus est et ipse Trevis,

cum Prisciliano, Felicissimo, Juliano, Euchrocia, ejusdem factionis auctoribus. Extant ejus ingenii opera diversis metris edita. Ib. cap. 122.

^c Tiberianus Bæticus scripsit pro suspicione qua cum Prisciliano accusabatur hæreseos Apologeticum tumentum compositoque sermone. Postea, post suorum eadem tædio victus exilii mutavit propositum, et juxta sanctam Scripturam, canis reversus ad vomitum suum, filiam, deçotam Christo virginem, matrimonio copulavit. Ib. cap. 123.

use the words of scripture, *the dog is returned to his own vomit* again, he persuaded his daughter, though a virgin devoted to Christ, to enter into the state of marriage.

The last sentence in that chapter is not clear; I find it differently translated. Du Pin^d: 'After the death of his friends, overcome by the tirefomness of a long exile, he married a young woman consecrated to Christ.' Tillemont: 'At length, he was weary of his exile, and quitted the party which he had embraced: but falling into a new fault, (to shew that he was no longer a Priscillianist) he married his daughter, who had consecrated her virginity to Christ.' Some would have it, that he married his own daughter; but surely without reason.

IV. As Jerom in the chapter just transcribed speaks of an apology written by Tiberian, it may not be amiss to add here a chapter of Isidore of Seville, in his book of Ecclesiastical Writers, concerning Idacius, one of Priscillian's accusers. He is different from Ithacius the chronologer, who^e flourished about the year 445, though S. Basnage^b speaks of the chronologer as one of the accusers of Priscillian. However, in another placeⁱ he speaks of him agreeably to the present sentiments of other learned moderns.

Says Isidore: 'Idacius^k a Spanish bishop, wrote a book, which was a sort of an apology; in which he shewed the detestable doctrines of Priscillian, and his magical arts, and shameful lewdness. And he says, that one Mark of Memphis, a great magician, and disciple of Manes, was Priscil-

^d Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 241.

^e Il se lassa enfin de son exil, et quitta le parti qu'il avoit embrasé. Mais tombant dans une nouvelle faute, (pour montrer qu'il n'étoit plus Priscillianiste,) il maria sa fille, qui avoit consacré sa virginité à J. C. Les Priscillianistes. Art. ix. fin. T. viii.

^f Matrimonio copulavit.] Id est, coëgit, ut nuberet. Sic enim explicat Sophronius, ne quis accipiat illum suam ipsius duxisse filiam. Erasmi Scholion, ap. Fabric. Bib. Ec. Vid. ibid. Mariani et aliorum annotationes. ^g Idacius, seu Hydatius, gente Hispanus, patria Gallæcus, domo Lemicensis,—Episcopus, claruit anno 445.—Obiit anno 468, vel sequente, admodum grandævus. Scripsit Chronicon ab anno 379. ad ann. 428,—idque postea ad annum 467 produxit. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 438. Et Conf. Pagi ad ann. 469. n. v. vi. et A. 431. n. lxi. Du Pin. T. 3. P.

ii. p. 232.

^b Magni quidem in ea re momenti est Idacii auctoritas, qui de miseri Priscillianii accusatoribus existimatur. Ad annum vero Theodosii ix. scribit in Chronico.—S. Basn. ann. 386. n. xi. Vid. eund. ad ann. 387. n. vi.

ⁱ Vid. ann. 468. n. v.

^k Idacius Hispaniarum episcopus, cognomento et eloquio Clarus, scripsit quemdam librum sub Apologetici specie: in quo detestanda Priscillianii dogmata, et maleficiorum ejus artes, libidinumque ejus probra, demonstrat: ostendens, Marcum quemdam Memphiticum, magiæ scientissimum, discipulum Manis fuisse, et Priscillianii magistrum. Hic autem cum Ursacio episcopo, ob necem ejusdem Priscillianii, cujus accusatores exstiterant, Ecclesiæ communione privatus, exilio condemnatur, ibique diem ultimum obiit, Theodosio majore et Valentiniano regnantibus. Ibid. De Script. Ec. cap. 2.

lian's master. This Idacius, together with the bishop Ursacius, on account of the death of Priscillian, whose accusers they had been, was deprived of the communion of the church, and sent into banishment, where he died in the time of Theodosius the elder and Valentinian.'

So writes Isidore of Seville, if he may be relied upon. It is a pity, that Jerom did not give an account of this work, if Ithacius or Idacius was the author of it. Cave¹ supposes Idacius, bishop of Emerita, to be meant by Isidore. Tillemont thinks^m, that Ithacius, whom Sulpicius calls bishop of Sossuba, was the author of this book: which to me also seems more probable; however this is a thing of small moment.

V. As Priscillian was the author of a sect in the fourth century, which made a great noise in the world, and subsisted a good while, I have judged it not improper, to give a distinct account of him and his followers.

We are not exactly informed of the time of the rise of this sect. Tillemontⁿ placeth it in 379: and it must be owned, that * Prosper, in his Chronicle, speaks of it under the year 379, when Ausonius and Olybrius were consuls. Nevertheless, he needs not to be understood to say precisely, that in that year, but only at that time, or about that time, appeared the heresy of Priscillianism. And I think we may form a different computation: a council was called at Saragossa upon occasion of it in 380, as will be seen presently; which may induce us to think, it first appeared four or five years sooner, perhaps, in 375 or 376: for nothing gets to a head, and becomes formidable at once. However I have dated it no higher than 378.

VI. Says Sulpicius Severus, whom I now intend to transcribe very largely, 'Mark^o, a magician of Memphis in Egypt, coming into Spain, perverted Agape, a woman of quality, and Elpidius the rhetorician: they instructed Priscillian.'

Whether this be quite right, I dare not take upon me to determine; for Sulpicius, who mentions these particulars, had just before said, that^p the origin of the sect was doubtful and

¹ Idacius Clarus, diversus ab Ithacio episcopo Sossubensi, urbis ejusdam, forsan Emeritæ episcopus, claruit anno 385. H. L. T. i. p. 280. ^m Les Priscillianistes.

art. 13. et note iv. T. viii.

ⁿ Ibid. art. 3.

* Ea tempestate Priscillianus episcopus de Galicia ex Manicheorum et Gnosticorum dogmate hæresim sui nominis condidit. Prosp. ap. Scal. Thes. p. 188. ^o Primus eam intra

Hispanias Marcus intulit, Egypto profectus, Memphis ortus. Hujus auditores fuere Agape quædam non ignobiles mulier et rhetor Elpidius. Ab his Priscillianus est institutus. S. Sever. Hist. Sacr. l. ii. cap. 46. al. 61. sub in. ^p Namque tum primum infamis illa Gnosticorum hæresis intra Hispanias deprehensa.—Origo istius mali oriens ab Aegyptiis. Sed quibus ibi initiis coaluerit, haud facile est disserere. Ib.

obscure. And he himself more than once calls¹ Priscillian the author of it. However, it must be owned, that Isidore above-cited, relates as from Ithacius, that Mark, a magician of Memphis, was Priscillian's master. And Jerom in one of his letters says, that 'Agape taught Elpidius, and he Priscillian.

'When' this sect was considerably increased,' as the historian proceeds, 'and many men and women, some of them of high rank, had embraced its tenets, and several bishops, particularly Instantius and Salvianus, had declared in favour of it; Hyginus, bishop of Corduba, in whose neighbourhood especially it prevailed, gave information of it to Idacius bishop of Emerita: who immediately engaged in the affair, and acted with such heat and violence, as was more likely to exasperate than reclaim men. Indeed he may be compared to a man, who thrusts a lighted torch into combustible matter.'

'After there had been a great deal of contention, and many warm disputes, a synod was convened at Saragossa [in 380]; where also the bishops of Aquitain were present; but Priscillian and his friends refused to appear.' Possibly, because they had already had experience of the unequal judgments of men; or because they were determined to follow their own convictions. 'Sentence therefore was passed upon them in their absence. In that sentence were included Instantius and Salvian, bishops, and Elpidius and Priscillian, laymen. It

¹ Priscillianum—principem malorum omnium. Id. c. 47. al. 69.

Cæterum—non repressa est hæresis, quæ illo auctore proruperat. c. 51. al. 66.

² In Hispaniis Agape Elpidium, mulier virum, cæcum cæca, duxit in foveam, successoremque sui habuit Priscillianum. Ad Ctesiph. ep. 43. T. iv. p. 477.

³ Is ubi doctrinam exitiabilem adgressus est, multos nobilium, pluresque populares, auctoritate persuadendi, et arte blandiendi, allicit in societatem. Ad hoc mulieres novarum rerum cupidæ, fluxa fide, et ad omnia curioso ingenio, catervatim ad eum confluebant. — Jamque paulatim perfidiæ illius tabes pleraque Hispaniæ pervaserat. Quin et nonnulli episcoporum depravati. Inter quos Instantius et Salvianus Priscillianum non solum consensione, sed sub quadam etiam conjuratione susceperant. Quo Adyginus [Hyginus] episcopus Cordubensis, ex vicino agens, comperto, ad Idatium Emeritæ civitatis sacerdotem refert. Is vero sine modo, et ultra quam oportuit, Instantium sociosque ejus lacessens, facem quandam nascenti incendio subdidit: ut

exasperavit malos, potius, quam compresserit. Ibid. cap. 46. al. c. 61. et 62.

Igitur post multa inter eos, et digna memoratu certamina, apud Cæsaraugustam synodus congregatur. Cui tum etiam Aquitani episcopi interfuerunt. Verum hæretici committere se judicio non ausi, in absentes tum lata sententia, damnatique Instantius et Salvianus Episcopi, Helpidius et Priscillianus laici. Additum etiam, ut, si quis damnatos in communionem recepisset, sciret, in se eandem sententiam promendam. Atque id Ithacio Sossubensi episcopo negotium datum, ut decretum Episcoporum in omnium notitiam deferret, maximeque Hyginum extra communionem faceret: qui cum primus omnium insectari palam hæreticos cepisset, postea turpiter depravatus in communionem eos recipisset. Interim Instantius et Salvianus, damnati judicio sacerdotum, Priscillianum etiam laicum, sed principem malorum omnium, una secum Cæsaraugustana Synodo notatum, ad confirmandas vires suas Episcopum Labinenfi oppido constituunt: rati nimirum, si hominem acrem et callidum sacerdotali auctoritate

'was

* was added, that if any received the condemned persons to
 * communion, he should be liable to the same sentence. And
 * it was ordered, that Ithacius, bishop of Sossuba, should no-
 * tify the decrees of the council to others, and particularly
 * should take care, that Hyginus be excommunicated: who,
 * though he had first informed against them, had since received
 * the heretics to communion. Hitherto Priscillian was a lay-
 * man; but now Instantius and Salvian, who were his steady
 * friends, thought it best to make him bishop of Abila, who
 * was the chief leader of the sect. After this Idacius and Itha-
 * cius, desirous to put an end to the affair, before it prevailed
 * too much, imprudently applied to the secular powers. They
 * therefore went to the emperor; and presenting requests un-
 * becoming the episcopal character, they obtained a rescript
 * from Gratian, that all heretics should not only be excluded
 * from the churches, and from the cities where they dwelt,
 * but from the whole extent of the Roman empire: which
 * obliged many of these Gnostics to abscond, or flee from the
 * usual places of their abode.'

'In this extremity Instantius, Salvian, and Priscillian, went
 * to Rome, in order to clear themselves before Damasus, then
 * bishop of that city; of the charges that had been brought
 * against them. In their journey, they made converts at seve-
 * ral places. When they came to Bourdeaux, Delphinus the
 * bishop would not suffer them to make any stay there: how-
 * ever, they were entertained at the country-seat of Euchrocia.'

armassent, tutiores fore sese. Tum vero Idacius atque Ithacius acius instare, arbitantes posse inter initia malum comprimi: sed parum sanis consiliis seculares iudices adessent; ut eorum decretis atque executionibus hæretici urbibus pellerentur. Igitur post multa et sæda Idacio supplicante, elicitur a Gratiano tum Imperatore rescriptum, quo universi hæretici excedere non ecclesiis tantum et urbibus, sed extra omnes terras propelli jubebantur. Quo comperto, Gnostici diffisi rebus suis, non ausi iudicio certare, sponte cessere, qui episcopi videbantur. Cæteros metus dispersit. Ib. cap. 47. al. c. 62. et 63.

At tum Instantius, Salvianus et Priscillianus, Romam profecti, ut apud Damasum, Urbis ea tempestate Episcopum, objecta purgarent. Sed iter eis præter interiorem Aquitaniam fuit: ubi dum ab imperitis magnifice suscepti, spargere perfidiæ semina. Maximeque Elufanam plebem, sane tum bonam et religioni studentem, pravis prædicationibus pervertere. A Burdigala per Delphinum repulsi, tamen in agro Euchro-

ciæ aliquantisper morati, infecere nonnullos suis erroribus. Inde iter ceptum ingressi, turpi sane pudibundoque comitatu, cum uxoribus, atque alienis etiam feminis, in quibus erat Euchrocia, ac filia ejus Procula: de qua fuit in sermone hominum, Priscillianus stupro gravidam, partum sibi graminibus abegisse. Hi ubi Romam pervenere, Damaso se purgare cupientes, ne in conspectum quidem ejus admissi sunt. Regressi Mediolanum, æque adversantem sibi Ambrosium reppererunt. Tum vertere consilia, ut, quia duobus Episcopis, quorum ea tempestate summa auctoritas erat, non illuserant, largiendo et ambiendo ab Imperatore cupita extorquerent. Ita corrupto Macedonio, tum Magistro Officiorum, rescriptum eliciunt: quo valeatis quæ prius decreta erant, restitui ecclesiis jubebantur. Hoc freti Instantius et Priscillianus repenvere Hispanias. Nam Salvianus in Urbe obierat. Ac tum sine ullo certamine ecclesias, quibus præfuerant, rectepere. Ib. cap. 48. al. c. 63. et 64.

Here

Here the historian, whom I transcribe, makes reflexions upon their manner of travelling; they having women in their company, particularly Euchrocia, wife or widow of Elpidius, and her daughter Procula. Concerning whom too it was said, that she had been with child by Priscillian, and had procured an abortion. Indeed such a way of travelling will be liable to some censures, though people behave with the utmost purity and sobriety. But, possibly, the violent proceedings of Ithacius might dispose some of Priscillian's friends to accompany him in this journey, as the only means of their safety: and they might be unwilling to be left behind at that season. Euchrocia, in particular, whose habitation was at Bourdeaux, or near it, might be under some apprehensions from Delphinus, bishop of Bourdeaux, and one of those bishops of Aquitain, who was present at the late council at Saragossa, and had joined in the sentence of condemnation there passed upon Priscillian and his adherents.

'When they came to Rome, desirous to clear themselves to Damafus, he would neither hear them nor see them. From thence therefore they went back to Milan; but neither would Ambrose hear their apology. Whereupon they altered their design of trying bishops, and applied to court; where they obtained a repeal of the fore-mentioned rescript of Gratian, with an order, that they should be restored to their churches.'

Sulpicius says, that this was owing to sums of money, wherewith they bribed the emperor's officers. Whether this be truly said, or not, there are no writings of Priscillian, or his friends, remaining, to give us any information. But this rescript seems to have continued in force in Spain throughout the reign of Gratian, and the reigns of Theodosius and Valentinian, to the time of (A) Honorius: for we find, from the first council of Toledo, in 400, (of which more hereafter,) that the Priscillianist bishops of that country were then in possession of their sees.

'Now then Instantius and Priscillian returned to Spain, and took possession of their churches without difficulty; but Salvian had died at Rome.'

(A) That edict of Gratian is by Baronius esteemed a great crime: for which God suffered him to be afterwards assassinated by Maximus. Immane profecto piaculum, quo suggestionem Macedonii Gratianus Princeps maxime pius, ejus, quod pie sancteque sanxerat, pravicator est factus. Ex quo quidem facinore sibi necem compa-

ravit. Nam ad immane scelus vindicandum, et hæreticos libera voluntate indulgentia Gratiani vagantes comprimendos, atque digna animadversione plectendos, suscitavit adversus eum Deus Maximus Tyrannus, qui Imperatori necem tulit, et in principes hæreticorum gladio animadvertit. Baron. Ann. 381. n. cx.

' Vol-

‘ Volventius ’ the proconsul, paying a due regard to Gratian’s rescript, favoured them; and Ithacius, who still had a mind to be troublesome, was checked, and was in danger of being taken up, as a disturber of the peace of the churches: he therefore went away into Gaul.’ Soon after this Maximus, a Spaniard, who had assumed the purple in Britain, invaded Gaul, and also became master of Spain, and had Gratian assassinated in August or September, 383. ‘ When Maximus made his public entrance at Treves, Ithacius was there; and in a short time he presented to the usurping emperor a petition against Priscillian and his adherents, filled with invidious charges of many crimes. Whereupon the emperor appointed a council to be held at Bourdeaux, and sent orders to the præfect of Gaul, and the vicar of Spain, to take care that all persons concerned should appear there. Instantius was first heard, and his defence being judged invalid, he was deposed. Priscillian, declining the judgment of the bishops, appealed to the emperor.’

Priscillian might think he had good reason to decline the judgment of the synod of Bourdeaux; forasmuch as Delphinus, bishop of that city, had already declared against him at the council of Saragossa. This council of Bourdeaux was held in 384, or rather in 385.

‘ The affair was now brought before the emperor: and the bishops Idacius and Ithacius, the accusers, were very forward to appear.’ Here Sulpicius says, ‘ he would not blame their zeal against heretics, if they had not been too intent upon victory:’ intimating, I think, that there was somewhat blameable in their manner of proceeding. He here also gives a very indifferent character of Ithacius, which I may take farther notice of hereafter. ‘ Martin bishop of Tours had oc-

‘ Verum Trachio [Ithacio] ad resistendum non animus, sed facultas defuit: quia hæretici corrupto Volventio Proconsule vires suas confirmaverant. Quinetiam Ithacius ab his quasi perturbator ecclesiarum reus postulatus, iussusque per atrocem executionem deduci, trepidus profugit in Gallias.—Jam rumor incefferat, Clementem Maximum intra Britannias fuisse imperium, ac brevi in Gallias erupturum. Itaque Ithacius statuit, licet rebus dubiis, novi Imperatoris adventum expectare: interim sibi nihil agendum. Igitur ubi Maximus oppidum Trevirorum victor ingressus est, ingerit preces plenas in Priscillianum ac socios ejus invidiæ atque crimi-

num. Quibus permotus Imperator, datis ad Præfectum Galliarum atque Vicarium Hispaniarum literis, omnes omnino, quos ille involverat, deduci ad Synodum Burdegalem jubet. Ita deducti Instantius et Priscillianus: quorum Instantius prior iussus causam dicere, postquam se parum expurgabat, indignus esse episcopatu pronuntiatus est. Priscillianus vero, ne ab Episcopis audiretur, ad Principem provocavit. Permissumque id nostrorum instantia.—Cap. 49. al. c. 64.

Ita omnes, quos causa involverat, ad Regem deducti. Secuti etiam accusatores, Idacius et Ithacius Episcopi: quorum studium in expugnandis hæreticis non repre-

‘ cation

‘ cation to come to Treves at this time : and he did not cease
 ‘ to reprove Ithacius, and to charge him to give over the pro-
 ‘ secution : he also waited on the emperor, and intreated him
 ‘ not to touch the lives of these unhappy men. It was suffi-
 ‘ cient, he said, and more than sufficient, that heretics be ex-
 ‘ pelled from the churches by the authority of bishops ; but it
 ‘ was a new and unheard-of thing, that a secular judge should
 ‘ take cognizance of the affairs of the church. In a word, as
 ‘ long as Martin was at Treves, the hearing was deferred : and
 ‘ when he was going away, with a resolution that can never be
 ‘ too much commended, he demanded, and obtained a promise
 ‘ from the emperor, that nothing should be done to affect the
 ‘ lives of those persons. But afterwards, the emperor being
 ‘ misled by the bishops Magnus and Rufus, and diverted by
 ‘ them from the milder counsels first resolved upon, referred
 ‘ the hearing of the cause to the præfect Evodius, a man of a
 ‘ morose and severe disposition. There were two hearings of
 ‘ the cause before him : and Priscillian being convicted of
 ‘ practising magic, and not denying, that he had taught ob-
 ‘ scene doctrines, and held nocturnal assemblies with lewd wo-
 ‘ men, and been wont to pray naked among them ; Evodius
 ‘ pronounced him guilty, and put him into custody, till he
 ‘ could make his report to the emperor. When the proceed-
 ‘ ings at the trial were brought to the palace, the emperor
 ‘ pronounced sentence, that Priscillian and his adherents ought
 ‘ to be put to death.’

‘ But Ithacius perceiving how disagreeable it would be to
 ‘ the bishops, if he should assist at the last proceedings against
 ‘ men who were to receive sentence of death, (for the cause
 ‘ was to be reheard ;) withdrew himself from the hearing :
 ‘ though to no purpose, after having compleated his wicked

henderem, si non studio vincendi plus
 quam oportuit certasset. — Namque tum
 Martinus apud Treveros constitutus, non
 desinebat increpare Ithacium, ut ab accu-
 satione desisteret : Maximum orare, ut san-
 guine infelicium abstinere : satis superque
 sufficere, ut Episcopali sententia hæretici
 judicati ecclesiis pellerentur : novum esse
 et inauditum nefas, ut causam Ecclesiæ ju-
 dex sæculi judicaret. Denique, quoad us-
 que Martinus Treveris fuit, dilata cognitio
 est. Et mox discessurus, egregia auctori-
 tate a Maximo elicit sponsonem, nihil
 cruentum in reos constituendum. Sed
 postea Imperator per Magnum et Rufum
 Episcopos depravatus, et a mitioribus con-

filiis deflexus, causam Præfecto Evodio per-
 misit, viro acri et severo. Qui Priscillia-
 num gemino judicio auditum, convictum-
 que maleficii, nec dissentem obscænis se
 studuisse doctrinis, nocturnos etiam tur-
 pium seminarum egisse conventus, nudum-
 que orare solitum, nocentem pronuntiavit, re-
 degitque in custodiam, donec ad Principem
 referret. Gestis ad Palatium delatis, cen-
 suit Imperator, Priscillianum sociosque
 ejus capitis damnari oportere. Cap. L. al.
 c. 64. et 65.

Cæterum Ithacius videns, quam invidio-
 sum sibi apud Episcopos foret, si accusato
 etiam pollremis rerum capitalium judiciis
 adstisset, (etenim iterari judicium necesse

‘ design.

design. Thereupon Maximus appointed, that Patricius, an advocate of the treasury, should perform the part of accuser. Upon his motion judgment was given, and Priscillian was condemned to die; and with him Felicissimus and Armenius, two presbyters, who had lately left the Catholics to follow Priscillian: Latronian also and Euchrocia were put to death. Instantius, who, as before said, had been condemned by the bishops, was banished to one of the British isles, called Syllina, [Scilly.] The sentences passed upon the rest were as follows: Asarinus and Aurelius, deacons, were put to death; Tiberian was banished to the island Syllina, and his goods were confiscated; Tertullus, Potamius, and John, men of low rank, and thought worthy of mercy, because they had confessed their own fault, and informed against their associates before they were put to the question, were banished for a time only, and within the limits of Gaul.—Nevertheless, after that Priscillian had been executed, the heresy which sprang from him was not suppressed, but was rather the more confirmed, and farther spread. For his followers, who before honoured him as a holy man, afterwards began to respect him as a martyr. The bodies of those who had been executed were carried into Spain, and there interred with much solemnity: and to swear by him was reckoned a very sacred oath. And among our people, (that is, the Catholics in Gaul,) has been enkindled an irreconcilable war, which for these fifteen years past has been carried on with fierce contentions, impossible by any means to be composed.

Thus I have carried on the history of Priscillian, and his followers, from their first appearance to the time of his death, and the death of several of his friends with him; and

erat :) subtrahit se cognitioni, frustra, callido jam scelere perfecto. At tum per Maximum adfutor adponitur Patricius quidam, fisci patronus. Ita eo insistente, Priscillianus capitis damnatus est, unaque cum eo Felicissimus et Armenius, qui nuper a Catholicis clerici Priscillianum secuti, desciverant. Latronianus quoque et Euchrocia gladio perempti. Instantius, quem superius ab Episcopis damnatum diximus, in Syllinam insulam, quæ ultra Britanniam sita est, deportatus. Ium deinde in reliquos sequentibus judiciis, damnatique Asarinus et Aurelius Diaconi gladio. Tiberianus, ademptis bonis, in Syllinam insulam datus. Tertullus, Potamius, et Joannes, tamquam viliores personæ, et digni misericordia,

quia ante quæstionem se ac socios prodidissent, temporario exilio intra Gallias relegati.—Cæterum Priscilliano occiso non solum non repressa est hæresis, quæ illo auctore proruperat, sed confirmata, latius propagata est. Namque sectatores ejus, qui eum prius ut sanctum honoraverant, postea ut Martyrem colere cœperunt. Peremptorum corpora ad Hispanias relata, magnisque obsequiis celebrata eorum funera. Quin et jurare per Priscillianum summa religio putabatur. Ac inter nostros perpetuum discordiarum bellum exarserat: quod jam per quindecim annos sædis dissensionibus agitatum, nullo modo sopiri poterat. Cap. 51. al. c. 65. et 66.

as we have the advantage of a contemporary historian, I have taken his account very much at large.

It is not easy to say exactly the time of these events. Tillemont^{*} thinks, these executions were made at Treves in 385: Basnage^{*} not till 387. And they both seem to argue plausibly. Other learned men^{*} are for the year 386.

VII. May it not be proper for us now to make some remarks, and try, whether we can form a reasonable judgment concerning the innocence, or the guilt of Priscillian and his followers? And I think, we may for the present take little notice of the charge of magic, few of us now a-days knowing what it means: and perhaps in old times, when the charge of magical practices was more common, many who talked about it, had no distinct notion of it. Moreover, the charge of magic has been so often found, upon examination, to be false and malicious, that of late little regard is had to it: we may therefore dismiss that part of the accusation as frivolous and insignificant, and confine our observations to other things, such as the obscene doctrines, and indecent actions, which Priscillian, in particular, was charged with. And it is likely, that many considerations may offer themselves tending to vindicate him, and shew the innocence of his followers.

1. And first of all, it is not unlikely, that the calling them by the name of Gnostics, and their being said to resemble the Manichees, was one ground of the charges brought against them. The Manichees were in disrepute: to the Gnostics in general almost every kind of impurity was ascribed. When once these men were called Manichees, many would impute to them all the supposed erroneous principles, and evil practices of that sect, and believe, that they were really guilty of them. Sulpicius entering upon the history of what related to them in his time, says, it^y was a Gnostic heresy; and again in the course of his narration^z he calls them Gnostics. It was commonly said, that the Priscillianist doctrine was brought into Spain by Mark of Memphis, said to be a disciple of Manes. Maximus, the emperor, in his letter to Syricius bishop of Rome, endeavouring to justify himself in putting them to death, calls them^a Manichees. And if it be not improper to

^u Les Priscillianistes. art. ix. et note x.

^x Ann 386. n. xi. et 387. n. vi.

^{*} Vid. Cav. H. L. De Priscilliano.

^y Namque tum primum infamis illa Gnosticorum hæresis intra Hispanias deprehensa. H. S. L. ii. c. 46. in.

^z Quo comperto, Gnostici diffisi rebus suis, &c. cap.

47. fin.

^a Cæterum quid adhuc proxime proditum sit Manichæos sceleris admittere, non argumentis, neque suspicionibus dubiis vel incertis, sed ipsorum confessione inter judicia—tua sanctitas—cognoscat. Ap. Baron. Ann. 387. n. lxvi.

allege here later writers, Jerom says, they ^b were a branch of the Manichees, Gnostics and Basilidians. How their agreement, or supposed agreement with the Manichees, was improved against them, to their prejudice, is evident from Pope ^c Leo; whose manner of insinuating the worst things against them, upon that account, must, I think, appear offensive to all candid persons.

2. Another thing that deserves consideration, is the character of the persons, who were accused and suffered in the time of Maximus, and were the leaders of the sect.

¹. Priscillian, as ^d Sulpicius says, was of a noble family, rich, ingenious, always in action, eloquent, learned, and a good disputant, having read a great deal. He had a happy genius, if it had not been perverted; for he had many good qualities both of body and mind: he slept little, and was very sparing in his diet, disinterested and moderate, spending little upon himself. Moreover, he had a modesty of countenance and behaviour, which gained him the esteem and respect of many.

It is not likely, that such a man should teach lewd doctrines, and pray naked among lewd women. Indeed, it is also said of him, that ^e he was proud and conceited of his learning; nevertheless, I do not perceive, how pride should lead a man into scandalous indecencies: it would rather secure him against all such things.

There is therefore no good reason to believe that account: if he confessed such things, it was upon the rack; for it is very probable, that he was tortured. Sulpicius is a very concise writer, and does not say it expressly of Priscillian; but there can be no doubt made, but the torture was used at this trial: for he says of Tertullus and two others, that they ^f made confession, before they were put upon the rack, ^g as we saw

^b Priscillianus in Hispania pars Manichæi—Qui quidem partem habent Gnosticæ hæreseos, de Basilidis impietate venientem. Ad Ctes. ep. 48. T. iv. p. 476.

^c Sequentes dogmata Cerdonis atque Marcionis, et cognatis suis Manichæis per omnia consonantes. Leo ep. 15. c. 4.

Faciunt hoc Priscillianistæ, faciunt Manichæi, quorum cum istis tam fœderata sunt sorda, ut solis nominibus discreti, sacrificiis autem suis inveniantur uniti. Ibid. c. 16. et passim.

^d Ab his Priscillianus est institutus, familia nobilis, prædives opibus, acer, iniquus,

facundus, multa lectione eruditus, disserendi ac disputandi promptissimus. Felix profecto, si non pravo studio corrupisset optimum ingenium. Prorsus in eo animi et corporis bona cerneret. Vigilare multum, famem et sitim ferre poterat, habendi minime cupidus, utendi parcissimus.—Quippe humilitas speciem ore et habitu prætendens honorem sui et reverentiam cunctis iniecerat. Ib. cap. 46.

^e Sed idem vanissimus, et plus justo inflator profanarum rerum scientia: quin et magicas artes ab adolescentia eum exercuisse creditum est. Cap. 46. p. 280.

just now. Tillemont^f also infers this from some things said by Pacatus. But forced confessions are often false. However, of this some farther notice may be taken hereafter.

². Another of the sufferers is Euchrocia, widow of Elpidius: she too was beheaded, or otherwise put to death with Priscillian, as we have seen in Sulpicius. Of her Pacatus says in his Panegyric: 'What^g were the crimes, for which the widow of an illustrious poet was dragged to punishment with a hook? She had no other fault, but that of being too religious, and worshipping the Deity with more than common zeal.' Euchrocia's moral character therefore was unblemished: she had no other fault, but that she was a Priscillianist.

Ausonius celebrating Elpidius among the other professors of Bourdeaux, of whom he had been one, commends his eloquence, and says, 'he^h was happy in dying before he reached old age, as he was not witness to the violent death of his wife, nor the fault of his daughter.' By which we perceive, that the story told of Procula by Sulpicius was common. Nevertheless it might not be true: it might be only common report, as the expressions of Sulpicius †† seem to imply: for such stories, when once raised concerning some persons, can never be dropt or forgotten. And that it was not true, may be argued from the character of Euchrocia, and from her continued respect for Priscillian: to which may be added, that, if our historians say right, Elpidius likewise had been a favourer of Priscillian, and even his master. And it may be reckoned very improbable, that Elpidius should either insil into Priscillian lewd principles, or receive them from him.

³. Another put to death with Priscillian was Latronian, or Matronian; of whom Jerom writes, as before quoted, that he was a learned man, and for his poetical works worthy to be compared with the ancients. It is not likely, that Latronian should be an associate with any man in such things as were laid to the charge of Priscillian.

^f Il semble, selon Pacatus, que l'on ait employé tourmens et la question pour examiner cette affaire, et que cela soit fait en presence mesme des Evesques accusateurs. Les Priscillianistes. Art. ix. T. viii. — cum gemitus et tormenta miserorum auribus ac luminibus hausissent. Pacat. Paneg. cap. 29.

^g Sed nimirum graves suberant, invidiosæque causæ, ut unco ad poenam clari vatis matrona raperetur. Objiciebatur enim, atque etiam exprobatatur mulieri viduæ

nimia religio, et diligentius culta Divinitas. Pacat. Paneg. c. 29.

^h Facunde, doctè, lingua et ingenio celer,

— — — — — Minus malorum munere expertus Dei,

Medio quod ævi raptus es:

Errore quod non deviantis filix,

Pœnaque læsus conjugis.

Auson. Profess. n. v.

†† De qua fuit in sermone hominum, Priscilliano stupro gravidam,

4. Beside these, several others suffered at this time: Felicissimus and Armenius, presbyters; Asarinus and Aurelius, deacons; these were put to death: Instantius and Tiberian were banished. Of all whom we know nothing amiss, but that they were followers or friends of Priscillian.

5. Among whom there were likewise many others of rank and quality, and several bishops, particularly Salvian, who died at Rome. And I think it is very observable, that Hyginus of Corduba, who first sent informations against them to Idacius bishop of Emerita, afterwards entertained a favourable opinion of them, and received them to communion. For which too he was soon after deposed and excommunicated by the council of Saragossa in 380, or 381. I can conceive no reason for this alteration of his conduct, but that he now embraced their principles, as right and true; or had found, that they were not so absurd and unreasonable, as he once supposed them to be; and therefore he disliked the heat and violence with which Idacius and others prosecuted those who held them: and the better to secure them from the hard treatment of others, he received them to communion.

6. Beside the numbers, and the rank and quality of the followers or friends of Priscillian, their good character in general is another thing very much in his favour. Tiberian's daughter had devoted herself to virginity, whilst he was a Priscillianist; and to shew that he had altered his mind, he induced her to enter into the state of marriage: which seems to shew, that these people were rather of an austere, than a loose course of life. Sulpicius in his account of Priscillian's journey through Aquitain to Rome, with the bishops Instantius and Salvian, says, they¹ perverted many of the people of Elusa, which were a good sort of people, and much devoted to religious exercises.

After^k the executions before-mentioned, the emperor Maximus, at the instigation of the bishops whom he had about him, gave a commission to some tribunes with power of the sword to go into Spain, to make inquiry after these heretics, and to confiscate their goods, or put to death such as should be ap-

¹ — Sparere perfidia semina: Maximeque Elusanam plebem, sane tum bonam et religioni studentem, pravis prædicationibus pervertere. H. S. l. ii. cap. 48. sub in. al. cap. 63.

^k Et jam pridie Imperator ex eorum sententia decreverat, Tribunos summa potestate armatos ad Hispanias mittere, qui hæreticos inquirerent, depre-

hensis vitam et bona adimerent. Nec dubium erat, quin sanctorum etiam maximam turbam tempestas ista depopulatura esset, parvo discrimine inter hominum genera. Etenim tum solis oculis judicabatur, cum quis pallore potius, aut veste, quam fide hæreticus æstimaretur. Dial. 3. cap. xi.

prehended.

prehended. This Martin earnestly opposed, dreading the consequences, and at length prevented it. 'Nor can there be any question made,' says Sulpicius, 'that if the commission had proceeded, it would have been fatal to multitudes of good men. For at that time little regard was had to men's real characters: if a man looked pale, or was modest in his garb, it was reckoned a mark of heresy, and sufficient to cast him, without making any particular inquiry concerning his faith.' In another place Sulpicius says, that¹ if the bishop Martin had not put a stop to that commission, it would have been the ruin of the churches in Spain.

7. The good opinion, which such men had of Priscillian to the last, wipes off all suspicion of lewd practices in him: for how was it possible, that they should honour him as an holy man when living, or respect him as a martyr when dead, who had been wont to pray naked among lewd women!

3. There are some circumstances to be observed, which appear to be in favour of Priscillian and his friends. After they had been condemned in the council of Saragossa, in 380, or 381, and after an edict had been obtained from Gratian, to the prejudice of all called heretics; Instantius and Salvian and Priscillian went into Italy, first to Damasus at Rome, and then to Ambrose at Milan, to apologize for themselves: which seems to imply, that they were not conscious of any very notorious misconduct, and that they hoped to be able to justify themselves before those eminent bishops. And though they did not obtain a hearing, they did not despond: but with a consciousness of their innocence, as it seems, applied to Gratian, and procured a repeal of the former edict against them, which had been given at the request of Idacius and Ithacius; and they obtained from the emperor a new edict, whereby they were restored to their churches. And whatever Sulpicius may say of the methods by which this new rescript was obtained, it remained in force throughout the reigns of Theodosius and Valentinian to the time of Honorius and Arcadius: for the Priscillianists were in possession of their churches when the council of Toledo met, in the year 400, as may appear hereafter.

What I would now argue from hence is, that when Priscillian and Instantius applied to Gratian for a repeal of the former rescript, and obtained a new rescript for restoring them and their friends to their churches; the odious and infamous doc-

¹ — Dummodo ut et Tribuni jam in excidium ecclesiarum ad Hispanias missi retraherentur. Dialog. 3. cap. xiii.

trines and actions, afterwards alleged against Priscillian at his trial, were not generally known to the catholics, or not believed by them: for if they had, a rescript would not have been granted to restore them to their churches. I think likewise, that it may be argued, that the infamous charges against Priscillian and others were not universally credited, even after their execution; for if they had, some care would have been taken about the repeal of this new rescript, before the year 400.

Another thing, which may be reckoned a circumstance in their favour, is, that Tiberian of Bætica wrote an *Apology* for himself and his sect: but no apology can be made for the things laid to the charge of Priscillian, if true. It is likely, therefore, that the design of that work was to shew his own, and his friends innocence. Evil things were laid to their charge by some; and others admitted suspicions of them: he endeavoured to shew, that those suspicions were unreasonable.

4. In the next place let us observe, who were accusers, and what was the management of the prosecution. Says Sulpicius, entering upon the account of this affair, when ^m it was brought before Maximus: ‘I should not blame the zeal of the bishops Idacius and Ithacius against heretics, if they had not been too intent upon victory: and therefore in my opinion, both accusers and accused were to blame. As for Ithacius, he was a man of no honour, and had no regard to right or wrong. He was audacious, impudent, proud, extravagant in his expences, and indulged himself to a great degree in eating and drinking. At length he proceeded to such excess of folly, that he was ready to charge all good men as associates or disciples of Priscillian, who were studious in reading, and practised fasting. Yea, this wretch had the assurance to charge the bishop Martin with heresy, a man who might be compared with the apostles!’

5. This was the chief prosecutor: and as for the manner of the prosecution, there are many things said by Sulpicius in his account of this affair, which shew the earnestness, with which it was carried on, from the beginning to the end. When Hy-

^m Ita omnes, quos causa involverat, ad Regem deducti. Secuti etiam aduatores Idacius et Ithacius Episcopi: quorum studium in expugnandis hæreticis non reprehenderem, si non studio vincendi plus quam oportuit certassent. Ac mea quidem sententia est, mihi tam reos quam aduatores displicere. Certe Ithacium nihil pensi, nihil sancti habuisse definitio. Fuit enim audax, loquax, impudens, sumtuosus, ven-

tri et gulæ plurimum impertiens. Hic stultitiæ eo usque processerat, ut omnes etiam sanctos viros, quibus aut studium inerat lectionis, aut propositum erat certare jejuniis, tamquam Priscilliani socios aut discipulos, in crimen arcesseret. Ausus etiam miser est, ea tempestate Martino episcopo, viro plane Apostolis conferendo, palam obiectare hæresis infamiam. Cap. L. lxxviii.

ginus bishop of Corduba had given Idacius of Emerita some information concerning these people, Sulpicius says, that 'Idacius presently acted with such heat and violence, as was more likely to exasperate than reclaim men: that he was like a man, who thrusts a lighted torch into combustible matter.' Sulpicius afterwards blames Idacius and Ithacius for going to the court of Gratian, and 'presenting there requests unbecoming the episcopal character,' whereby they obtained an edict against all heretics. He also says, that when Ithacius first applied to Maximus at Treves, he 'presented a petition against Priscillian^a and his adherents, filled with invidious charges of many crimes.' In these last expressions especially, and in several expressions made use of in the characters of Idacius and Ithacius just transcribed; that 'they were too intent upon victory;' that 'Ithacius had no regard to right or wrong,' and that he was 'audacious and impudent:' I think it is intimated, that Ithacius (and perhaps Idacius likewise) told lies against Priscillian and his adherents. And it seems to me, that about this time were forged those charges of infamous doctrines and actions, which brought on their execution.

* Beside all this, we have perceived, that the question was used in the trial of these persons before the præfect Evodius. But there is no relying upon confessions extorted in that way: the accused might be thereby compelled to speak against their own conviction, and be made to say all their accusers wanted them to say.

There is one thing mentioned by Sulpicius, which very much disparages the evidence, upon which these unhappy men were convicted. 'Tertullus, Potamion, and John, men of low condition, were judged worthy of mercy, because they had confessed their own crimes, and discovered their associates, before they were put to the question.' These, so far as we can perceive, were the only witnesses, beside the accusers; persons of low condition, who had been among the followers of Priscillian, and would say any thing to save themselves from the torture, or other punishment, which the circumstances of things made them apprehensive of.

6. We cannot forbear to observe, who were the judges: the supreme judge was the usurping emperor Maximus, who was a man of a severe temper; and when he came into Gaul, was elated with the successes of a civil war. Again, it is said

^a Ingerit preces plenas in Priscillianum ac socios ejus invidiæ atque criminum. — Imperatorem Maximum, ferocis ingenii virum, et bellorum civilium victoriam elatum. Sulp. de Vit. Martin. c. xx. p. 337. Cap. 49. p. 287.

of him, that^p he had many good properties, but was of a severe temper, and was covetous, and at this time in want of money; and therefore, as may be supposed, too willing to seize the estates of those who were decried as heretics. For which reason there was danger of involving many good men, and of easily admitting evidence against those who were brought into suspicion: Sulpicius assures us, that such things were then said by many. And if the emperor was not of himself covetous, his circumstances at that time rendered him necessitous; which could not but have some influence upon his counsels with regard to divers matters.

Then Evodius, the præfect of the prætorium, before whom the cause of Priscillian and his friends was heard, was of a rigid and severe temper, as before-mentioned.

7. Finally, let us observe the judgments of men at that time concerning this affair. And I think it must have been already taken notice of in the process of this history, that all did not approve of these proceedings. However, it may be worth the while to be a little more particular; and then, possibly, we may perceive, that there were many who disliked them and condemned them.

¹. Martin, bishop of Tours, generally allowed to be an understanding and holy man, very much disliked these proceedings. Whilst the cause was depending, ‘he said, it was sufficient, and more than sufficient, that those men, if convicted of being heretics, should be condemned by bishops, and cast out of the churches.’ He blamed Ithacius, and earnestly charged him to give over the prosecution before the emperor: and he interceded with Maximus, ‘that the lives of those men might not be touched.’

The conduct of Ithacius, and some others who had been active in this affair, being censured by some, there was a synod of bishops at Treves, in 387, as^q Basnage supposes, in which their behaviour was examined. The sentence, as may be well supposed, was in his favour: he was acquitted. One bishop however there was, Theognostus by name, who had the gene-

^p Maximus Imperator, alias sane bonus, depravatus consiliis sacerdotum. S. Sev. Dialog. 3. c. xi. p. 495.

Verum primo die, atque altero, suspendit hominem [Martinum] callidus Imperator, sive ut rei pondus imponeret, sive quia nimis sibi implacabilis erat, seu quia, ut plerique tunc arbitrabantur, avaritia repugnabat: siquidem in bona eorum inhæverat. Fertur enim ille vir multis bonisque actibus

præditus, adversus avaritiam parum consultus: nisi forte regni necessitate, quippe exhausto superioribus Principibus ei publicæ ærario, pene semper in expeditione atque procinctu bellorum civilium constitutus, facile excusabitur, quibuslibet occasionibus subsidia imperio paravisse. Ibid. p. 498.

^q Ann. 387. n. vii.

rosity openly to declare against him, and refused to communicate with him and the other bishops his favourers.

At this time Martin had occasion to come to Treves, to intercede with Maximus for the lives of some officers, now in his custody, who had acted with great zeal in the service of their master Gratian. He was very unwilling to communicate with Ithacius, and the bishops who sided with him. However, he complied at last upon these two conditions, that the lives of the officers for whom he interceded should be spared, and that the tribunes, sent to Spain to try heretics there, should be recalled. And though his communion with them was but for a day only, as soon as he was got out of Treves, in his way home, he humbled himself for what he had done.

Some expressions of Sulpicius, relating to Martin's concern to prevent the tribunes going to Spain to try heretics, appear very remarkable. 'The bishop Martin had several petitions,' he says, 'to ask of Maximus, when he was admitted into his presence. Beside others, he was to intercede for the Count Narfes, and the president Leucadius, who had exerted themselves for Gratian. But his principal care was, that tribunes might not be sent to Spain with power of the sword. For it was the kind concern of Martin, not only to save the catholics, who were in great danger to be harassed

Interea Episcopi, quorum communionem Martinus non inibat, trepidi ad Regem concurrunt, prædamptos se conquerentes, adsum esse de suo omnium statu, si Theognosti pertinaciam, qui eos solus palam lata sententia condemnauerat, Martini armaret auctoritas. — Sed ille, licet Episcopis nimio favore esset obnoxius — alia longe via Sanctum vincere parat. Ac primo secreto accersitum blande appellat: hæreticos jure damnatos more judiciorum publicorum, potius quam insectationibus sacerdotum: non esse causam, qua Ithacii, cæterorumque partis ejus communionem putaret esse damnamdam: Theognostum odio potius, quam causa fecisse discidium: eundemque tamen solum esse, qui se a communione interim separarit: a reliquis nihil novatum. Quinetiam ante paucos dies habita synodus Ithacium pronuntiaverat culpa non teneri. Quibus cum Martinus parum moveretur, Rex ira accenditur, ac se de conspectu ejus abripuit. Et mox percussores his, pro quibus rogaverat, dirigunt. Dialog. 3. c. 12.

Quod ubi Martino compertum jam noctis tempore est, palatium intravit. Spondet, si parceretur, se communicaturum: dummodo ut et Tribuni jam in excidium

ecclesiarum in Hispanias missi retraherentur. Nec mora intercessit. Maximus indulget omnia. Postridie Felicis Episcopi ordinatio parabatur, sanctissimi sane viri, et plane digni, qui meliore tempore sacerdos fieret. Hujus diei communionem Martinus iniit, satius æstimans ad horam cedere, quam his non consulere, quorum cervicibus gladius imminebat. Verum tamen summa vi Episcopis nitentibus, ut communionem illam subscriptione firmaret, extorqueri non potuit. Postero die se inde proripiens, cum revertens in via mœstus ingemisceret, se vel ad horam noxiæ communioni fuisse permixtum. Ib. c. xiii.

Postridie palatium petit. Præter multas, quas evolvere longum est, has principales petitiones habebat: pro Narfete Comite, et Leucadio Præfide, quorum ambo Gratiani partium erant, pertinacioribus studiis, quæ non est temporis explicare, iram victoris meriti. Illa præcipua cura, ne tribuni cum jure gladiorum ad Hispanias mitterentur. Pia enim erat sollicitudo Martino, ut non solum Christianos, qui sub illa erant occasione vexandi, sed ipsos etiam hæreticos liberaret. Dial. 3. c. xi.

‘thereby, but the heretics also.’ Which is a strong testimony to the iniquity of the proceedings of those times. It also shews, I think, that neither Martin, nor the historian Sulpicius, supposed the followers of Priscillian to be guilty of the things laid to their charge by Ithacius and his friends.

². In 386 or 387 (B) Ambrose, bishop of Milan, was sent ambassador to Maximus by Valentinian the younger. When he was at Treves, he refused to communicate with the bishops there. In his letter to the emperor Valentinian he says: ‘Maximus seeing’, that I separated myself from the bishops of his communion, who also solicited the death of certain persons who erred from the faith, in great anger bid me depart immediately; which I was not unwilling to do: I was more concerned to see them sending into banishment the bishop Hyginus, an old man who had nothing left but the last breath. And when I desired his courtiers, not to send away the old man without cloathing, and other necessities, ‘I was sent away myself.’ All that Ambrose says, therefore, of the Priscillianists is, that they ‘erred from the faith.’ And it is plain, he did not approve of putting them to death. And if this be Hyginus, bishop of Corduba, as is generally supposed, can it be imagined, that such a feeble old bishop, should countenance the lewd conduct and principles, which were by some ascribed to Priscillian? No, for certain, he knew not of any such things taught and practised by Priscillian, or his followers; if he had, he would not have favoured them. And do we not here also evidently see the cruelty of the courtiers of Maximus, and of the bishops, by whom he was influenced?

³. Pacatus, a heathen and therefore a disinterested man, of Gaul and therefore well acquainted with these transactions, in his Panegyric pronounced at Rome in the presence of Theodosius the emperor, and the senate, in 389, about a year after

(B) Tillemont, *Les Priscillianistes* note x. allows, that Ambrose was at Treves in 387: he says, that the execution of the Priscillianists was then over. But Basnage an. 387. n. vi. (who also says that Ambrose was with Maximus in 387,) thinks it plain, that the executions were still depending. Which affords a strong argument, that Priscillian was not put to death before 387. Undoubtedly Sulpicius knew the time very well; and in the year 400, speaks of its being then fifteen years since that event: but fifteen may be used by him as a round number, and be equivalent to thirteen or

fourteen.

† Postea, cum videret me abstinere ab Episcopis, qui communicabant ei, vel qui aliquos, devios licet a fide, ad necem petebant; commotus eis iussit me sine mora regredi. Ego vero libenter, etsi me plerique insidias evasurum non credebant, ingressus sum iter: hoc solo dolore percitus, quod Hyginum Episcopum senem in exilium ducti comperi, cui nihil jam nisi extremus superesset spiritus. Cum de eo convenirem comites ejus, ne sine velle, sine plumario paterentur extrudi senem, extrusus ipse sum. Ambros. Epist. cl. i. 24. T. ii. p. 891.

the death of Maximus, among other instances of his mal-administrations, reckons this, of which he speaks in this manner. 'But' why do I stay to recount the deaths of so many 'men, when their cruelty was such as to spill the blood of 'women? For they practised the utmost rigour toward a 'sex that is usually spared even in war. And what were 'the causes of this barbarity? What were the crimes, for 'which the widow of an illustrious poet was dragged to punishment with a hook? She had no other fault, but that of 'being too religious, and too exact in the worship of the 'Deity. And is it not fit, that these should be the greatest 'crimes, when bishops become accusers? for these were the 'informers in that affair, bishops by name, but indeed dragoons and executioners: who not content with having 'spoiled unhappy men of the estates of their ancestors, sought 'also their lives; and when they had made them poor, 'loaded them with crimes, that they might put them to death: and what follows, which I transcribe below without translating. For here is enough to shew, that he did not think the charges brought against Priscillian and his followers to be true. Moreover, he afterwards calls them innocent men; and speaks of the covetousness of Maximus, as what disposed him to receive informations against men, that he might seize their estates. And what Pacatus says in the presence of Theodosius, and his court, may be supposed to be approved by them. Tillemont here observes, that * Pacatus was a heathen, and in what he says of Euchrocia, he only has an eye to the exterior profession which the Priscillianists made, of a very austere and retired course of life. Very right. This was their profession. Therefore their master had not taught them obscene doctrines, nor set them an

* De virorum mortibus loquor, cum descensum recorder ad sanguinem seminarum, et in sexum, cui bella parant, non parce scævum? Sed nimirum graves suberant, invidiosæque causæ, ut unco ad pœnam clari vatis matrona raperetur. Obiciebatur enim, atque etiam exprobrabatur mulieri viduæ nimia religio, et diligentius culta Divinitas. Quid hoc majus poterat intendere accusator sacerdos? Fuit enim, fuit et hoc delatorum genus, qui nominibus antisites, revera autem satellites, atque adeo carnifices, non contenti miseros avitis evoluisse patrimoniis, calumniabantur in sanguinem, et vitas premebant reorum, jam pauperum. Quinetiam cum judiciis capitalibus assistent, cum gemitus et tor-

menta miserorum auribus ac luminibus hausissent, cum licetorum arma, cum damnatorum frena tractassent, pollutas pœnali manus contactu ad sacra referebant, et caeremonias quas incestaverant mentibus, etiam corporibus impiabant. Hos ille Phalaris in amicis habebat, hi in oculis ejus, atque etiam in osculis erant: nec injuria, a quibus tot simul votiva veniebant, avaro divitum bona; cruento innocentium pœna, impio religionis injuria. Pacat. Paneg. Theod. cap. 29.

* Est un Payen qui parle, et qui ne s'arreste qu'à la profession extérieure que faisoient les Priscillianistes d'une vie plus austère, et plus retirée. Les Priscill. Art. x. T. viii.

example

example of extravagant indecency, by frequently praying naked with lewd women.

4. After the executions were over, Ithacius^y was often blamed in conversation; and to excuse himself he would say, that he had acted according to the direction of others: which is not unlikely. And^z it looks as if Sulpicius could have named some of them; but he judged it more prudent not to do so.

5. When Maximus had been put to death in 388, Ithacius and his party lost their principal support; and Ithacius was soon afterwards deposed. Prosper in his Chronicle, at the year next after that in which Maximus lost his life, says, 'that Ithacius^b and Ursacius were deprived of the communion of the church, on account of the death of Priscillian, whose accusers they had been.' And Isidore of Seville, as before quoted[†], says, that Idacius, together with Ursacius, was deprived of the communion of the church, and sent into banishment, where he died. But Sulpicius says, that^c Ithacius was the only bishop that was deposed upon this account. He adds, 'Nardacius, though less guilty, of his own accord resigned his bishopric; which might be said to have been wisely, and modestly done, if he had not endeavoured to recover his lost station.' Who is this Nardacius, and who Ursacius, mentioned by Prosper and Isidore, is not certain. As Ursacius is never mentioned by Sulpicius, nor Nardacius any where else by him, some have thought, that hereby is meant Idacius. On the other hand, as many bishops had some concern in this affair, and Idacius has not been mentioned lately by Sulpicius, Nardacius may be reckoned a different person. However that be, I suppose Sulpicius ought to be relied upon, that Ithacius only was now deposed.

^y Quod initio jure judiciorum et egregio publico defensus, postea Ithacius in jurgis solitus, ad postremum convictus, in eos retorquebat, quorum id mandato et consiliis effecerat. H. S. l. ii. c. 51. p. 391.

^a Maximus Imperator, alias sane bonus, depravatus consiliis sacerdotum, post Priscilliani necem, Ithacium Episcopum, Priscilliani accusatorem, ceterosque illius socios, quos nominari non est necesse, vi regia tuebatur, ne quis ei crimini daret, opera illius cujuscumque modi hominem fuisse damnatum.

—Congregati apud Treviros Episcopi tegebantur, qui quotidie communicantes

Ithacio communem sibi causam fecerant. Dial. 3. cap. xi. in.

^b Ithacius et Ursacius Episcopi ob necem Priscilliani, cujus accusatores fuerant, Ecclesie communionem privantur. Prosp. p. 389. Ap. Scalig. Thef. Temp.

[†] See note k p. 455.

^c — ad postremum convictus, in eos retorquebat, quorum id mandato et consiliis effecerat. Solus tamen omnium episcopatu detrusus. Nardacius, [f. Nam Idacius, Vorst.] licet minus nocens, sponte se episcopatu abdicaverat. Sapienter id, et veracunde, nisi postea amissum locum repetere tentasset. H. S. l. ii. c. 5. p. 392.

*. Another thing, as I apprehend, manifesting the different judgments of men concerning this affair, is what Sulpicius says at the conclusion of his narration, of the perpetual feuds and contentions, which there had been among the catholics in Gaul for fifteen years past, from the time of those executions to the time of his finishing his history, in the year of our Lord 400. There were very few Priscillianists in Gaul; the divisions betwixt the bishops and other Christians in that country were owing, therefore, as seems probable, to different sentiments concerning this affair. Some vindicated the proceedings against Priscillian and his followers, others blamed them; and these disputes ran so high, that sometimes they could scarce communicate with one another. Ambrose, in the year 392, said, that^d he had been oftentimes hindered from going into Gaul by the frequent divisions of the bishops there.

7. There are two councils, whose debates may probably afford some farther light in this affair. The first is the council of Saragossa, mentioned by Sulpicius, and supposed to have been held in 380, or 381: in the decrees of this council several things are condemned; as * fasting on the Lord's-day, and some other days usually reckoned festivals by the catholics; absenting from church on these days; assembling in private houses and country places; receiving the eucharist, without consuming it [or swallowing it] at church; going barefoot; taking upon them the character of teachers, without authority; referring perhaps to Agape, Elpidius, and Priscillian, who was yet a layman; bishops receiving those who had been excommunicated; clergymen leaving their stations, and betaking themselves to a retired monastic kind of life, because of the luxury, or other faults observable among ecclesiastics. These, and some other such like things are forbidden, which may be reckoned erroneous or irregular. Here are no sentences of condemnation upon those who teach obscene doctrines,

^d — propter quorum frequentes diffensiones crebro me excusaveram. De Obitu Valentin. n. 25. T. ii. p. 1181.

^e Item Legit: ne quis jejuset Die Dominico.—Item legit: Eucharistiæ gratiam si quis probatur in ecclesia non consumpsisse, anathema sit in perpetuum.—Item legit: Viginti et uno die, quo a 16 Kalendas Januarii usque in diem Epiphaniæ, quæ est 8. Idus Januarii, continuis diebus, nulli liceat de ecclesia se absentare, nec latere in domibus, nec secedere ad villam, nec montes petere, nec nudis pedibus incedere, sed con-

currere ad ecclesiam.—Item lectum est, ut hi per disciplinam, aut sententiam Episcopi ab ecclesia fuerint separati, ab aliis Episcopis non sint recipiendi. Item legit: si quis de clericis propter luxum, vanitatemque præsumptam, de officio sponte discesserit, ac velut observatorem legis monachum voluerit esse magis quam clericum, ita de Ecclesia repellendum.—Item lectum est: Ne quis doctoris sibi nomen imponat, præter has personas, quibus concessus est.—Concil. Cæsaraugust. Ap. Labb. T. ii. p. 1009, 1010,

and

and practise gross indecencies; but here are intimations of pretensions to more than ordinary strictness and mortification. And, if I mistake not, the decrees of this council, and their silence about the shameful things imputed to Priscillian at his trial, very much confirm the conjecture formerly proposed to be considered; that no such things had been heard of, till they were invented by Ithacius, and others: who, when once they had begun to prosecute Priscillian before the civil magistrate, were too intent upon victory, as Sulpicius observed, and without any regard to truth, forged calumnies, and heaped upon him reproaches of infamous actions, till they gained their end, and had him executed.

The other council was held at Toledo, in the year 400, or thereabout; of which a sufficient account^f may be seen in several authors, so far as relates to this affair. Here were reconciled to the church Symphosius and Dictinius, noted Priscillianists, and several others of that sect. It seems, that they two had been with Ambrose at Milan, to intreat his favourable interposition in their behalf: if that is not certain, it is however manifest, that Ambrose became their mediator, and proposed terms upon which they might be received. Ambrose died in 397. Why the affair was deferred is not known: but it appears from the acts of the council, that Simplician had then succeeded him in the see of Milan. Ambrose had proposed, that^g they should be received to the peace of the church upon retracting their errors, and confessing the faults which they had been guilty of; and they were now received. Symphosius's Priscillianism had many aggravations; he^h seems to have been a follower of Priscillian from the beginning, and to have declined the judgment of the council of Saragossa in 380. Moreover, the terms proposed by Ambrose were, thatⁱ

^f Baron. Ann. 405. n. xliiii.—lix. Pagi Crit. in Baron. Ann. 405. n. xii.—xvii. Tillemont Les Priscillian. art. xiv.—xvii. T. viii. Beaufobr. Diss. sur les Adamites. Part. ii. p. 377—379.

^g Arduum nobis esset audire jam dictos. Literis tamen sanctæ memoriæ Ambrosii, quas post illud concilium ad nos miserat: Ut si condemnassent quæ perperam egerant, et implessent conditiones, quas præscriptæ literæ continebant, reverterentur ad pacem: [Adde quæ sanctæ memoriæ Siricii Papa suassisset:] magnam nos constat præstitisse patientiam. Conc. Tolet. i. ap. Labbe. T. ii. p. 1230.

^h Etsi diu deliberantibus verum, post Cæsaraugustanum Con-

cilium, in quo sententia in certos quosque dicta fuerat, sola tamen una die, præsentem Symphosio, qui postmodum declinando sententiam præsens audire contemserat. Ibid.

— In Synodo Cæsaraugustana, anno 381 adversus Priscillianum coacta: cujus judicium declinasse dicitur Symphosius in sententia Toletanæ i. Synodo, se subducens. Pagi Ann. 405. n. xliii.

ⁱ Cæterum extortum sibi de multitudine plebis, probaret Symphosius, ut ordinaret Dictinium Episcopum, quem sanctus Ambrosius decrevisset bonæ pacis locum tenere presbyterii, non accipere honoris augmentum. Constat enim illud, quod alios per diversas ecclesias ordinasset, quibus de-

for the present all should abide in the stations they were in, without alteration. Nevertheless, in the mean time, before those terms were accepted and executed, Symphosius had ordained Dictinius bishop, who before was only presbyter; which, he said, had been extorted from him by the importunate requests of the people. Symphosius likewise, or he and Dictinius together, had lately ordained in the vacant sees of the province of Galicia several bishops, who were in the Priscillianist scheme. In particular they had ordained Paternus bishop of Braga, the chief city of Galicia: who, however, now renounced Priscillianism before the council, having been convinced of his error, he said, since his ordination, by reading the works of Ambrose bishop of Milan.

Dictinius had been a forward Priscillianist; he had written several books much esteemed by the sect; particularly a book called *Libra*, the Pound, consisting of twelve parts or arguments, as the Roman pound had twelve ounces. Augustine* speaks of him and his book. I have put some of his passages, where he speaks of them, in the margin. Pope Leo likewise speaks of Dictinius. He¹ complains of the Priscillianists, that they still read his writings, and followed his errors, though he had renounced them.

These two learned Priscillianist bishops, and leading men among them, Symphosius and Dictinius, were received by the catholics in the council of Toledo, upon abjuring their former errors, embraced by them, or advanced and promoted by them in their discourses or writings. Their form^m of renunciation and

erant sacerdotes: habentes hanc fiduciam, quod cum illis propemodum totius Galiciæ sentiret plebium multitudo. Ex quibus ordinatus est Paternus Bracarensis ecclesiæ Episcopus. In hanc vocem confessionis primus erupit, et sectam Priscilliani fecisse, sed factum Episcopum liberatum se ab ea lectione librorum S. Ambrosii esse juraret. Cone. Tol. i. ibid.

* — et Dictinii Episcopi — famam ludare mordaciter. Est hoc tolerabilius adhuc, quia ille putatur fuisse catholicus, atque ex illo errore correctus — cum deinde Dictinii librum, cujus nomen est *Libra*, eo quod pertractatis duodecim questionibus velut unctis explicatur, tantis extulerit laudibus, ut talem librum — multis librarum auri millibus pretiosorem esse testetur. Contr. Mendac. ad Consent. cap. 3. n. 5. T. vi.

Quæ cum ita sint, quoniam nimis longum est omnia pertractare quæ in illa *Libra*

Dictinii sunt posita velut imitanda exempla mentiendi. Ibid. cap. 17. n. 35. Vid. et cap. 21. n. 41.

¹ Postremo autem capitulo hoc prodidit iusta querimonia, quod Dictinii tractatus, quos secundum Priscilliani dogma conscripsit, a multis cum veneratione legerentur: cum si aliquid memoriæ Dictinii tribuendum putant, reparationem ejus magis debeant amare quam lapsum. Non ergo Dictinium, sed Priscillianum legunt, et illud probant quod errans docuit, non quod correctus elegit. Leon. Ep. 15. cap. xvi. al. ep. 93.

^m Symphosius dixit: Juxta id quod paulo ante lectum est, in membrana nescio qua, in qua dicebatur Filius innascibilis, hanc ego doctrinam, quæ aut duo principia dicit, aut Filium innascibilem, cum ipso auctore damno, qui scripsit. — Item dixit: Omnes libros hæreticos, et maxime Priscilliani doctrinam, juxta quod hodie lectum est,

confession

confession I have placed below somewhat at large. Now likewise was received Comasius, presbyter under Symphosius; his confession is in the passage just transcribed. Isonius^a was also now received upon confession, who had lately been baptized, and ordained bishop by Symphosius. In^o like manner Vegetinus, who had been bishop before the council of Saragossa.

From the reception of these ecclesiastics by the council, ariseth a strong argument, that the Priscillianists were not guilty of the evil practices laid to the charge of Priscillian, and generally imputed to Gnostics: if they had, they would not have been received upon renouncing their former errors: if that had been the case, I suppose they would have been deposed, and put into a state of penance, and declared incapable of ever holding any office in the church.

I would just take notice of one thing more, mentioned in the account of the acts of this council, relating to Herenas bishop of some place in Spain: that^p all his clergy in general, without being asked, cried out aloud before the council, that Priscillian was a catholic and a holy martyr. Herenas himself likewise said the same, and that Priscillian had suffered persecution from the bishops of his time. Which judgment of his, the bishops of the council said, was a reflection upon many holy men, some deceased, others still living: they therefore declared Herenas, and his clergy, and divers other bishops

ubi innascibilem Filium scripsisse dicitur, cum ipso auctore damno. Comasius Presbyter dixit: Nemo dubitet, me cum domino meo Episcopo sentire, et omnia damnare quæ damnavit, et nihil ejus præferre sapientię, nisi solum Deum.—Diſtinus Episcopus dixit: Sequor sententiam domini mei, et patris mei, et genitoris et doctoris mei Symphosii. Quæcumque locutus est loquor.—Et ideo omnia quæ Priscillianus aut male docuit, aut male scripsit, cum ipso auctore condemno. Ibid. p. 1229.

Post aliquanta. — Diſtinus Episcopus dixit: Audite me, optimi sacerdotes. Corrigite omnia.—Hoc enim in me reprehendo, quod dixerim unam Dei et hominis esse naturam. Item dixit: Ego non solum correctionem vestram rogo, sed et omnem præsumptionem meam de scriptis meis arguo atque condemno.—Item dixit:—Quæcumque conscripsi, omnia me toto corde respuere. In ead. pag. sub in.

^a Item Isonius nuper baptizatum se a Symphosio, et Episcopum factum, hoc se tenere, quod in præſenti concilio Symphosius

professus est, respondit. Ibid. p. 1230.

^o Vegetinus vero olim ante Cæsaraugustanum concilium Episcopus factus, similiter libros Priscilliani cum auctore damnaverat, ut de cæteris acta testantur. Ibid.

Vegetinum autem, in quem nulla specialiter dicta fuerat ante sententia, data professione, quam synodus accepit, statim communioni nostræ esse reddendum. Ib. p. 1231. in.

^p Herenas clericos suos sequi maluerat, qui sponte, nec interrogati, Priscillianum catholicum, sanctumque Martyrem clamassent: atque ipse usque ad finem catholicum hunc esse dixisset, persecutionem ab Episcopis passum. Quo dicto omnes sanctos, jam plurimos quiescentes, aliquos hac luce durantes, suo judicio deduxerit in reatum. Hunc cum his omnibus, tam suis clericis, quam diversis Episcopis, hoc est, Donato, Acurio, Emilio: qui ab eorum professione recentes maluissent sequi consortium perditorum, decernimus ab sacerdotio submovendum. Ib. p. 1230, 1231.

adhering

adhering to him in that sentiment, to be deposed from their offices.

This serves to satisfy us of two things: First, that about thirteen or fourteen years after the event, the Priscillianists (and, it is likely, many others) were of opinion, that Priscillian had been falsely accused, and unjustly put to death. Secondly, it shews, that lewd principles and practices were no part of their religion: but they disapproved them, and reckoned the imputation of them to any man to be reproachful and dishonourable.

². Once more, the testimony of Jerom in favour of Priscillian is not unworthy of our regard: for in his book of *Illustrious Men*, as cited at the beginning of this chapter, he says, that ‘by means of the faction of Idacius and Ithacius, Priscillian had been put to death at Treves; that to that day he was accused by some as having been of the Gnostic heresy; whilst others defended him, saying, that he did not hold the opinions which had been imputed to him.’ And in the next chapter he gives an account of Latronian and Tiberian of Bætica, two followers of Priscillian, and particularly commends the former for his learning and poetical writings. It is true, in another work, written about the year 415, he says, that ³ Priscillian had been condemned by the civil magistrate, and by the judgment of all the world: which has led some to say, that Jerom was now better informed concerning the Priscillianists, than when he wrote the former work in 392. But, ⁴ as Quesnell says, Jerom could not be then ignorant of the affairs of the church. That learned man therefore would suppose, that the chapter in the book of *Illustrious Men* had been interpolated. To which Du Pin well answers, that ⁵ conjecture, though unsupported by any manuscript, might have been of some moment, if it were not well known, that Jerom has oftentimes spoken very differently of one and the same person. The case, I think, is this: in the book of *Illustrious Men* he writes with the calmness of an historian; in the other he is out of humour, and writes in the heat of controversy. We may then be well assured, that in the year 392, when Jerom wrote his *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers*, there were different opinions among men concerning Priscillian; and that there were some, who did not allow him to have held

² Quid loquar de Prisciliano, qui et seculi gladio, et totius orbis auctoritate damnatus est? Ad Ctesiph. ep. 43. T. iv. p. 4.
³ Vir, nihil eorum, quæ in Ecclesia gere-

bantur, ignarus. Quenell. Not. et Observation. in Leon Ep. xv. p. 448.

⁴ Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. ii. p. 241.

the opinions imputed to him, or to have been guilty of the crimes laid to his charge.

We may therefore, I think, after this long discussion of the affair, and after weighing what can be said on both sides, assent to the judgment of that wise and good man, Martin, bishop of Tours, who lived at that time, who was several times at the court of Maximus, before and after the trial of Priscillian, and was well acquainted with the bishops chiefly concerned in that prosecution. He said, 'It was sufficient, and more than sufficient, that being convicted of heresy by the bishops, they should be turned out of the church.' And when that was done, I presume, they ought to have been allowed to live quietly in the world, and to worship God in separate assemblies, in their own way, under the protection of the civil government. Which likewise may be supposed to have been Martin's intention: for, as it seems, neither he, nor his disciple and historian Sulpicius, approved, that magistrates should interpose in things of religion. They therefore did not like, that civil penalties should be inflicted upon erroneous Christians, but only church-censures: and it is likely, that they judged this method to be most conducive to the interests of religious truth. They hoped, that by such censures, men might be awakened to consideration; and that by reasons and arguments, calmly proposed, they who had been seduced, might be convinced of their error, brought back to the catholic church, and to the acknowledgment of the right faith.

VIII. Hitherto we have chiefly considered the origin of this sect, and the history of its author, and his first followers, with their sufferings, as related by Sulpicius, who has given but a very general account of their opinions. And it may be expected, that some farther notice should be taken of these by us.

1. There is no account of this sect in Epiphanius. Fabricius^t indeed has referred us for a knowledge of them to Epiphanius and Damascenus; but it is a mistake of that excellent man, through haste. Epiphanius speaks there only of the Montanists, sometimes called Priscillians from Priscilla, one of Montanus's prophetesses; and Damascenus's article in the place referred to is only Epiphanius's summary or recapitulation. Quesnell^u says, Epiphanius takes no notice of this sect. The

^t De Priscilliano—ejusque hæresi—
Epiphanius et Damascenus hæresi 49.
Fabric. not. ad Hieron. de V. I. cap. 121.
Ap. Bib. Ec. ^u De hac hæresi nihil
apud Epiphanius, qui forte eam a Gnosti-

corum, Manichæorum, aliorumque sectis,
quibuscum pleraque habebant Priscillianistæ.
communis, non distinxit. Quesn. Not. et
Oserv. in Ep. xv. S. Leon. p. 447.

reason,

reason, he thinks, may be, that he did not distinguish it from the Gnostic or Manichæan, with whom the Priscillianists very much agreed. But I should think, that there is another very obvious reason of Epiphanius's silence, and more likely to be the true reason: which is, that this sect did not become famous, till after Epiphanius had finished his work. Nor are they expressly mentioned by Philaster; whether he has quite omitted them, will be considered hereafter. However, there are several writers, which may be of use to us, beside Sulpicius Severus, the historian already transcribed: Augustine has a long article concerning them in his book *Of Heresies*; Orosius, of Spain, sent or delivered to Augustine a *Memoir or Commemorative* relating to them. And other writers have mentioned them.

2. Augustine at the beginning of his article concerning them, which I transcribe below, says, 'The * Priscillianists, followers of Priscillian of Spain, have a mixture of the doctrines of the Gnostics and Manichees, together with errors borrowed likewise from other heresies.'

3. Let that suffice for his general character of this people. I shall now add some particulars, though not in the order in which they lie in Augustine.

4. I therefore in the first place observe their opinion concerning the scriptures. 'In * which respect,' he says, 'they are more cunning than the Manichees; for they reject not any part of the canonical scriptures, but receive them all, and endeavour to support themselves by their authority. And when any texts are alleged against them, they strive to evade them by allegorical interpretations. They likewise use apocryphal scriptures, and argue from them in favour of their opinions.'

5. And in divers places, Augustine speaks to the like purpose, saying, that * they received all the canonical scriptures intire; using also apocryphal books. And says, whatever is alleged against them from scripture, they evade sometimes by cunning and artful, at other times by ridiculous and stupid in-

* Priscillianistæ, quos in Hispania Priscillianus instituit, Maxime Gnosticorum et Manichæorum dogmata permixta sectantur. Quamvis et ex aliis hæresibus in eos sordes tamquam in sentinam quamdam horribili confusione confluerint. De Hær. cap. 70. T. viii.

† Hoc versutiores etiam Manichæis, quod nihil Scripturarum Canonicarum repudiant, simul cum Apocryphis legentes omnia, et in auctoritatem su-

mentes, sed in suos sensus allegorizando vertentes quicquid in sanctis libris est, quod eorum evertat errorem. Ibid.

‡ Priscillianistæ vero accipiunt omnia et canonica et apocrypha simul. Sed quæcumque, quæ contra eos sunt, in suæ perversitatis sensus aliquando callida et astuta, aliquando ridicula et hebeti expositione pervertunt. Ad Ceret. ep. 227. n. 3. T. ii.

terpretations. He also observes, that ^b they had a hymn, said by them to be the hymn, which Christ sung at the last supper with the disciples. He moreover says, that hymn was to be found in apocryphal scriptures, not peculiar to the Priscillianists, but used by other heretics likewise. A main ^c part, if not the whole of that hymn, may be seen in Augustine's letter to Ceretius just quoted. What respect they had for that, or other apocryphal scriptures, is not very clear: there does not appear any thing heterodox in that hymn; they owned it was not in the canonical scriptures, and they ^d explained it by them, and agreeably to them.

6. Orosius, Augustine's friend, and of Spain, says, that ^e the Priscillianists, differing from the Manichees, endeavour to support their doctrine by the scriptures of the Old, as well as of the New Testament. He also says, they ^f had a book intitled the Memoir or Memoirs of the Apostles: in which, possibly, the above-mentioned hymn was inserted.

7. Priscillian is one of those heretics, who, as Vincent of Lerins ^g says, in almost every page of their works insert quotations of the books of the Old or New Testament.

8. Pope Leo with a partiality, well becoming a man that uses authority in things of religion, and loves to make the worst of every thing relating to those called heretics, says, the ^h Priscillianists pretend to receive the books of the Old Testament. However, he cannot deny, but that therein they differ from the Manichees. As ⁱ for their apocryphal books, he not

^b Hymnus sane, quem dicunt esse Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui maxime permovet venerationem tuam, in scripturis solet apocryphis inveniri. Quæ non proprie Priscillianistarum sunt, sed alii quoque hæretici eis nonnullarum sectarum impietate vanitatis utuntur, inter se quidem diversa sentientes:—sed scripturas istas habent in sua diversitate communes, easque illi præcipue frequentare assolent, qui Legem veterem et Prophetas non recipiunt. Ibid. n. 2.

^c Habes verba eorum in illo codice ita posita: *Hymnus Domini, quem dixit secrete sanctis Apostolis discipulis suis, quia scriptum est in Evangelio: Hymno dicto ascendit in montem.*—[Matt. xxvi. 30.] Ibid. n. 4.

^d Deinde, quid causæ est, ut eundem hymnum isti secundum scripturas canonicas conentur exponere? Ibid. n. 5.

^e Priscillianus, primum in eo Manichæis miserior, quod ex Veteri quoque Testamento hæresim confirmavit. Oros. Comm. ad Augustin. n. 2. T. viii.

^f Et hoc ipsum confirmant ex libro quodam, qui inscribitur Memoria Apostolorum: ubi Salvator interrogari a discipulis videtur secreto, et ostendere, quia de parabola Evangelica, quæ habet: *Exiit seminans seminare semen suum.* [Matt. xiii. 3.] Ibid.

^g Lege Pauli Samosatani opuscula, Priscilliani, Eunonii, Joviniani, reliquarumque pestium: cernas infinitam exemplorum congeriem, prope nullam omitti paginam, quæ non Novi aut Veteris Testamenti sententiis fucata et colorata sit. Vincent. Comm. p. 356. Paris. 1669.

^h — Quia etsi Vetus Testamentum, quod isti se suscipere simulant, Manichæi resutant, ad unum tamen finem utrorumque tendit intentio: cum quod isti abdicando impugnant, isti recipiendo corrumpunt. Ad Turib. ep. 15. cap. 16. p. 230.

ⁱ Apocryphæ autem scripturæ, quæ sub nominibus Apostolorum multarum habent seminarium falsitatum, non solum interdiciendæ, sed etiam penitus auferendæ sunt,

only prohibits them, but directs also, that they should be sought for, and burnt.

9. Turibius bishop of Astorga in Spain, who ^{*} is supposed to have flourished about the year 447, speaks [†] of their using apocryphal scriptures, the same with those used by the Manichees; as the Acts of Andrew, Thomas, and John: and he particularly mentions the Memoir of the apostles, taken notice of by Orosius.

10. According to Jerom. ^m the Priscillianists made use of apocryphal books of the Old, as well as of the New Testament; particularly, the Ascension of Isaiah, and the Revelation of Elias.

11. It must therefore, I think, be allowed, that the Priscillianists, beside the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testament, made use of apocryphal books: what respect they had for them, is not certain; but from these testimonies it may be reckoned probable, that they shewed them a good deal of respect, more than catholics generally did: though after all, they need not to be supposed to have equalled them to those scriptures, which are usually called canonical. This then was their doctrine concerning the scriptures.

12. By several they are said to have held the Sabellian doctrine concerning the Deity. So ⁿ Augustine in his book of Heresies, and ^o elsewhere; so likewise ^p Orosius. It is the last particular in Orosius's Memoir, and in Augustine's chapter concerning the Priscillianists in his book of Heresies; but it makes the first ^q in Pope Leo's letter concerning the errors of the Priscillianists, written in the year 447.

atque ignibus concremandæ. Quamvis enim sint in illis quedam, quæ videantur speciem habere pietatis, numquam tamen vacua sunt venenis, et per fabularum illecebras hoc latenter operantur, ut mirabilium narratione seductos laqueis cujuscunque erroris involvant. Ibid. cap. 15.

^k Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 440. et Tillemont. S. Leon. art. xvii.—xix. Tom. xv.

^l — Specialiter autem Actus illos, qui vocantur S. Andreæ: vel illos, qui appellantur S. Joannis, quos sacrilego Leucius ore conscripsit: vel illos, qui dicuntur S. Thomæ, et his similia: ex quibus Manichei, et Priscillianistæ, vel quæcumque illis est secta germana, omnem hæresim suam confirmare nituntur: et maxime ex blasphemissimo illo libro, qui vocatur Memoria Apostolorum, in quo ad magnam pervertitatis suæ auctoritatem, doctrinam Domini mentiuntur. Turib. cap. v. ap. S.

Leon. p. 232.

^m Ascensio enim Isaie et Apocalypsis Eliæ hoc habent testimonium. Et per hanc occasionem, multaque hujusmodi, Hispaniarum et Lusitanie deceptæ sunt mulierculæ. &c. In II. cap. lxiv. T. iii. p. 473, 474. Conf. ad Theodor. ep. 53. al. 29. p. 581, T. iv.

ⁿ De Christo Sabellianam sectam tenent, eundem ipsum esse dicentes, non solum Filium, sed etiam Patrem, et Spiritum Sanctum. De Hær. cap. 70.

^o Contra quam veritatem Priscillianus Sabellianum antiquum dogma restituit, ubi ipse Pater qui Filius, qui et Spiritus Sanctus perhibetur. Ad Oros. cap. 4. T. viii.

^p Trinitatem autem solo verbo loquebatur. Nam unionem absque ulla existentia aut proprietate asserens.—Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, hunc esse unum Christum dicebat. Oros. Comm. ap. S. Aug. T. viii.

^q Primo itaque ca-

13. Pope Leo presently afterwards^r charges them with agreeing with the Arians in their sentiment concerning the person of Christ: whether consistently, or not, let others determine.

14. They are supposed to have had some doctrine concerning the innascibility of Christ: we^s see it in the confessions of those who renounced Priscillianism before the council of Toledo, and returned to the catholics. Pope^r Leo seems not to have understood the meaning of this, though it be one of his articles of accusation against them, and he talks a good deal about it. I do not perceive Orosius or Augustine to say any thing distinctly about this point.

15. They had also some opinions concerning the soul, which were disliked by many of the catholics. They^a are said to have held, that the soul was consubstantial to the Deity: so says Leo; nor is this denied, but supposed to be their opinion, both^s by Orosius and Augustine. To the like purpose Jerom^r, in a passage which I transcribe below; shewing, that there were among Christians, as well as among the philosophers, different opinions concerning the origin of the soul.

16. Farther, Pope Leo adds, It^s was also said, that they believed the pre-existence of human souls, and that they had sinned in heaven, before they were sent into bodies. And^a

pitulo demonstratur, quam impie sentiant de Trinitate, qui et Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, unam atque eandem asserunt esse personam, tamquam idem Deus nunc Pater, nunc Filius, nunc Spiritus Sanctus nominetur. Ep. 15. cap. i. p. 227.

^r In secundo capitulo ostenditur ineptum vanumque commentum de processionibus quarundam virtutum ex Deo.—In quo Arianorum suffragantur errori, dicentium, quod Pater Filio prior sit.—Ibid. cap. 2.

^s Symphosius Episcopus dixit:—Hanc ego doctrinam, quæ aut duo principia dicit, aut Filium innascibilem, cum ipso auctore damno, qui scripsit. Concil. Tolet. i. ap. Labb. Conc. T. ii. p. 1220. Vid. et supr. not. ^m p. 477, 478. ^t Tertii vero capituli sermo designat, quod iidem impii asserant, ideo Unigenitum dici Filium Dei, quia solus sit natus ex virgine. Quod utique non auderent dicere, nisi Pauli Samosatensis et Photini viros haussissent: qui dixerunt, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, antequam nasceretur ex virgine Maria non fuisse. Si autem isti aliud de suo sensu intelligi voluerint, utque principium de matre dant Christo: asserunt necesse est, non unum esse Filium Dei.—Quoqueverum igitur se convulerint, in magnæ tendunt impietatis abruptum.—Ib. cap. 3.

^a Quinto capitulo refertur, quod animæ hominis divinæ asserant esse substantiæ, nec a natura Creatoris sui conditionis nostræ distare naturam. Quam impietatem, ex Philosophorum quorundam et Manichæorum opinione manantem, catholica fides damnat. Ib. cap. v. p. 228.

^x Vid. Aug. ad Oros. cap. i. et iv. T. viii.

^y Super animæ statu memini vestræ quæstionculæ, imo maximæ ecclesiasticæ quæstionis: Utrum lapsa de cælo sit, ut Pythagoras Philosophus, omnesque Platonicæ, et Origenes, putant: an a propria Dei substantia, ut Stoici, Manichæus, et Hispana Priscilliani hæresis suspicantur: an in thesauro habeantur Dei, olim conditæ, ut quidam ecclesiastici stulta persuasione credunt: an quotidie a Deo fiant, ut mittantur in corpora:—an certè ex traduce, ut Tertullianus, Apollinaris, et maxima pars Occidentium autumant. &c. Ad Marcellin. et Anapls. ep. 78. al. 89. T. iv. p. 642.

^z Decimo autem capitulo feruntur asserere, animas, quæ humanis corporibus inferuntur, fuisse sine corpore, et in cælesti habitatione peccasse. Leo. ib. c. 10.

^a — docens animam, quæ a Deo nata sit, de quodam promtuario procedere, profiteri ante Deum, se pugnaturam, instrui adhortatu angelorum: dehinc descenden-

Orosius

Orosius and ^b Augustine both speak of their believing the pre-existence of human souls, and their descent from heaven, through several regions, into bodies allotted to them. But they do not say, that they supposed those souls to have sinned in their pre-existent state.

17. Another opinion ascribed to them by Pope Leo is, that the ^c sons of promise are born of women, but conceived by the Holy Spirit. I do not observe this in Orosius, or Augustine: perhaps it is a consequence, which some deduced from their principles. Whether allowed by them, may not be certain; nor is it very intelligible: and perhaps there is nothing heretical in it.

18. Several other opinions are imputed to them: whether rightly, or not, cannot be certainly said, as we have none of their writings; and what their enemies say is not easy to be understood. However, I observe farther,

19. Pope Leo says, they ^d fasted on the day of Christ's nativity, and on the Lord's-day; which may be true, so far as I know: and though herein was an irregularity, yet in their way they honoured those days. Moreover, I think, it ought to be allowed, that this adds not any credit to the charge of licentiousness.

20. Another article imputed to them is a disadvantageous opinion of marriage. Pope Leo says, 'They ^e condemn marriage, and the procreation of children; in which, as in almost every thing else, they agree with the Manichees. And, as their manners shew, they therefore dislike marriage, because of the confinement of that state, and it is an obstruction to lewdness.'

21. Augustine expresseth himself to this purpose: 'With'

tem per quosdam circulos a principatibus malignis capi, et secundum voluntatem victoris principis in corpora diversa contrudi, eisque adscribi chirographum. Oros. Comm. ap. Aug. T. viii.

^b Hi animas dicunt ejusdem naturæ atque substantiæ, cujus est Deus, ad agonem quemdam spontaneum in terris exercendum, per septem cælos, et per quosdam gradatim descendere principatus, et in malignum principem incurere, a quo istum mundum factum volunt, atque ab hoc principe per diversa carnis corpora seminari. &c. De Hær. cap. 70.

^c Non autem annotatio manifestat, quod filios promissionis ex mulieribus quidem natos, sed ex Spiritu Sancto dicant esse conceptos. Ibid. cap. 9.

^d Quarto autem capitulo continetur, quod Natalem Christi—non vere isti ho-

norent, sed honorare simulent, jejunantes eodem die, sicut et die Dominico, qui est dies resurrectionis Christi. Ubi supr. c. 4.

^e Septimo loco sequitur, quod nuptias damnant, et procreationem nascentium perhorrescunt. In quo, sicut pene in omnibus, cum Manichæorum profanitate concordant. Ideo, sicut eorum mores probant, conjugalem copulam detestantur: quia non est illis libertas turpitudinis, ubi pudor et matrimonii servatur et sobolis. Ib. cap. 7.

^f Carnes tamquam immundas esca ipsa devitat. Conjuges, quibus hoc malum potuit persuadere, disjungens, et viros a nolentibus feminis, et feminas a nolentibus viris. Opificium enim omnis carnis non Deo bono et vero, sed malignis angelis tribuunt. Hær. 70. T. viii.

‘ regard to diet, they look upon the flesh of animals as impure.
 ‘ Where this sect prevails, it is a common thing with them to
 ‘ separate men from their wives, and women from their hus-
 ‘ bands, without mutual consent. For all fleshly productions,
 ‘ they ascribe not to the good and true God, but to malignant
 ‘ angels.’

This, probably, was the reason of their disliking marriage: and they must consequently have condemned fornication, and every kind of uncleanness.

22. Pope Leo says, ‘ that upon this head the Priscillianists
 ‘ agreed with the Manichees.’ We have no writings of Priscillianists, to give us light, and but very imperfect accounts of their opinions: concerning the Manichees we have fuller information; and we can be satisfied, that as they had a disadvantageous notion of marriage, they absolutely condemned fornication, and such like things. This I suppose to have been made out ^g formerly; I would now confirm it by a passage of Faustus not yet alleged: ‘ We ^h do not think,’ says that Manichæan bishop, ‘ that the lives and manners of robbers are to
 ‘ be approved, because Jesus shewed mercy to a robber on the
 ‘ cross; or that we are to approve the lives of publicans and
 ‘ harlots, because Christ declared their sins to be forgiven, and
 ‘ that they went into the kingdom of heaven before those who
 ‘ behaved proudly. For when he absolved a woman taken in
 ‘ adultery, whom the Jews brought before him, he said to her,
 ‘ Go, and sin no more.’ And Pope Gregory the first, surnamed the great, as well as Leo, says; the ⁱ Manichees condemned marriage, because they had observed virginity to be commended in the sacred oracles. If therefore the Priscillianists condemned marriage, it may be supposed, that they went upon the like grounds with the Manichees: and if they judged marriage itself not sufficiently pure; they loudly condemned fornication, and all sins of the flesh.

IX. We are now led to the consideration of two branches of immorality charged upon the Priscillianists, by some writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. One is lying, to conceal their

^g Vol. iii. p. 409—411.

^h — Sed tamen non idcirco dicemus, et latronum vitas et mores nobis probabiles esse debere, quia Jesus latroni indulgentiam dedit: aut quia publicanis ignoverit errata, dixeritque, quod etiam præcederent ipsi ad regnum cælorum eos qui superbe gesserunt. In injustitia namque et in adulterio deprehensam mulierem quandam,

Judæis accusantibus, absolvit ipse, præcipiens ei, ut jam peccare desineret. Faull. l. 33. cap. i. ap. Augustin. T. viii.

ⁱ Quia autem in sacro eloquio Manichæus virginitatem laudari comperit, conjugia damnavit. Jovinianus quia concedi conjugia cognovit, virginittis munditiâ dispexit. Gregor. Moral. in Job. l. xix. c. 18. T. i. p. 618. D.

principles; the other is the practice of impurity: I shall transcribe in the margin these charges, as expressed by Augustine and Jerom; afterwards I shall take notice of what is said by Pope Leo: and if I speak to both these charges together, for the sake of brevity, I hope it will not be taken amiss.

1. Of their falshood Augustine speaks in the article^k for this sect, in his book of Heresies, and^l in another work. He says, they approved of lying, to conceal from others their real principles and actions; they were said to have this among the rules of their sect, Swear, forswear; but never betray a secret.

2. Augustine^m speaks of lewd women among the Priscillianists.

3. Jeromⁿ speaks of the Priscillianists, as practising lewdness in a very shameful manner.

But there are considerations, which may dispose us to think, that here is some misrepresentation or aggravation of both these points.

¹. It is very likely, that the charge of falshood against these people, as well as of impurity, was partly owing to their being reckoned a branch of the Gnostics, to whom such things were generally imputed. A passage of Sulpicius, which^o I place below, may justify this supposition.

². Augustine seems not to have full proof of the falshood, which he imputes to them. He says, it was reported of them, and it had been confirmed by some who had once been of the sect, and had left them. But the testimony of such persons I take to be of little or no value; some such people might be willing to say any thing, to ingratiate themselves with their new friends.

^k Propter occultandas autem contaminationes et turpitudines suas habent in suis dogmatibus et hæc verba: Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli. De Hær. cap. 70. T. viii.

^l Possunt enim aliqui hæretici reperiri fortasse immundiores. Sed nullus istis fallacia comparatur. Alii quippe, ut sunt hominum vitia, de hujus vitæ consuetudine vel infirmitate mentiantur. Isti autem in ipsa nefaria doctrina hæresis suæ præceptum habere perhibentur, ut occultandorum dogmatum suorum causa etiam falsa juratione mentiantur. Hi qui eos experti sunt, et ipsorum fuerant, atque ab eis Dei misericordia liberati sunt, etiam verba ipsa præcepti hujus ista commemorant: Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli.

Ep. 237. al. 253. n. 3. T. ii.

^m Quod si enim ex numero Priscillianistarum impudicarum aliqua semina injiciat oculus in catholicum Joseph. Contr. Mendac. ad Consent. cap. vii. n. 17. T. vi.

ⁿ Priscillianus in Hispania, pars Manichæi (de turpitudine cujus te discipuli diligunt plurimum) soli cum solis clauduntur mulierculis, et illud eis inter coitum amplexusque decantant.—Qui quidem partem habent Gnosticæ hæreseos de Basilidis impietate venientem. Ad Ctesiph. ep. 43. T. iv. p. 476.

^o Namque tum primum infamis illa Gnosticorum hæresis intra Hispanias deprehensa, superstitione execrabilis, arcanis occultata secretis. Hist. Sa. l. ii. c. 46. al. 61. in.

3. There were martyrs among the Priscillianists, as ^p Augustine allows. Therefore, probably, there were seasons, when they reckoned themselves obliged to declare the truth: though at other times, from prudential considerations, they might judge it proper to be upon the reserve: as indeed most people will think, who lie under difficulties and discouragements.

4. Augustine himself acquits them of excessive lewdness. For he says, 'A ^q more impure sect, possibly, may be found; but never were there any men comparable to them for falsehood.'

5. According to Augustine, the Priscillianists had an argument in behalf of lying from Thamar. Whereupon he says, 'Why ^r do they think, that Thamar is to be imitated when she lied; and that Judah may not be imitated in the commission of uncleanness?' Augustine therefore knew very well, that the Priscillianists did not approve of fornication, or adultery, or any other such sins of the flesh.

6. Jerom, in his letter to Ctesiphon, speaks of 'Priscillianism as a doctrine of perfection, and that they pretended to uncommon degrees of knowledge and holiness. If therefore they transgressed, it was not by principle, but through infirmity, and the force of sudden temptation, as the men of other sects too often do.

7. In another work he speaks of the Priscillianists, as 'asserting, that with due care men may arrive at such perfection, as to be free from sin, even in thought. They who had this notion, must have aimed at perfection, and could not by principle indulge themselves in evil actions.

8. I do not observe Orosius, in the account which he gives Augustine of the Priscillianists, to charge them either with falsehood or lewdness.

X. We now proceed to Pope Leo; for I have thought it worth the while to place him by himself, and to consider distinctly what he says; I ^u therefore transcribe him largely

^p — Exsecrantur Priscillianistarum falsa martyria. Contr. Mendac. cap. v. n. 9. T. vi.

^q See before note ^l p. 487.

^r Cur autem isti imitandum sibi Thamar existimant mentientem, et imitandum Judam non existimant fornicantem? Contr. Mendac. cap. xiv. n. 30. T. vi.

^s Priscillianus in Hispania pars Manichæi — verbum perfectionis et scientiæ sibi vindicantes. Ad Ctesiph. ep. 43. p. 476. in.

^t — ut præteream Manichæum, Priscillianum, — quorum omnino ista sententia

est: posse ad perfectionem, et non dicam ad similitudinem, sed æqualitatem Dei humanam virtutem et scientiam pervenire: ita ut asserant se ne cogitatione quidem et ignorantia, quum ad consummationis culmen ascenderunt, posse peccare. Adv. Pelag. Dial. i. T. iv. p. 484. in.

^u In execrabilibus autem mysteriis eorum, quæ quanto immundiora sunt, tanto diligentius occultantur, unum prorsus nefas est, una est obscæritas, et similis turpitudine. Quam etsi eloqui erubescimus, sollicitissimis

below.

below. The sum of what he says is this: 'The Priscillianists agree with the Manichees in sentiments, consequently in practice. Wicked and obscene mysteries had been proved upon the Manichees; and therefore they were also used by the Priscillianists. Moreover, such things had been proved upon the Priscillianists in former times.'

In answer to which I say: 1. I am of opinion, that obscene mysteries never were proved upon the Manichees by Pope Leo, or any others. And I would willingly refer to what has been already observed relating to this point in ^x a preceding volume, and particularly to the Remarks upon Mr. Bower's account of the Manichees ^{xx}. 2. Supposing such things to have been proved concerning the Manichees, it does not follow, that they may be righteously ascribed to the Priscillianists. For allowing the Priscillianists to have agreed with the Manichees in some of their peculiarities, it cannot be thence reasonably concluded, that they embraced them all: yea it is apparent, that they differed from them, and in a material point, receiving the scriptures of the Old Testament: not now to mention any thing else. 3. Pope Leo says, obscene mysteries had been proved upon the Priscillianists in former times; referring, I suppose, to the trial of Priscillian and his friends. To which I answer: I am of opinion, that they were not then proved upon Priscillian nor his followers; and of this let every one judge, who has perused the preceding part of this chapter. 4. I think, it appears, that Pope Leo had not any positive proof, that the Priscillianists used obscene mysteries, or practised any wickedness by principle: for he alleges not any such proof; and founds his charges against them upon their supposed agreement with the Manichees, and the transactions of former times.

XI. As yet I have taken nothing from Philaster, because the Priscillianists are no where mentioned by him under that name. But he has an article of heretics, whom he calls Abstinents, which^y I shall now transcribe at the bottom of the page.

tamen inquisitionibus indagatam, et Manichæorum, qui comprehensi sunt confessione detectam, ad publicam fecimus pervenire notitiam. — Quod autem de Manichæorum fœdissimo scelere, hoc etiam de Priscillianistarum incellissima consuetudine olim compertum, multumque vulgatum est. Qui enim per omnia sunt impietate sensuum pares, non possunt in sacris suis esse dissimiles. Ep. 15. cap. 16. p. 230, 231.

^x See Vol. iii. p. 408—410.

^{xx} Ibid. p. 549—554.

^y Sunt in Galliis, et Hispaniis, et Aquitania, veluti Abstinentes, qui et Gnostico-rum et Manichæorum particulam perniciosissimam æque sequuntur, eandemque non dubitant prædicare: separantes perluasionibus conjugia hominum, et esearum abstinentiam promittentes, quæ non ex legis præcepto, sed promotionis cœlestis, et dignitatis causa voluntati hominum talis a Christo concessa est gratia. Dicit enim Dominus Petro: *Non omnes capiunt hoc verbum.* [Matt. xix. 11.] Et iterum idem Dominus

It

It is the opinion of ^z Fabricius, and ^a Tillemont, that the Priscillianists are the heretics here intended by Philaster.

What he says is briefly this: That in Gaul, and Spain, and Aquitain, there was a sort of Abstinents, a branch of the Gnostics and Manichees, who dissolved marriages without mutual consent, and enjoined abstinence from some kinds of food. And he shews the inconveniences of the former of those doctrines, and confutes it by texts of scripture, as he does also the latter. He moreover says, that they captivated many people.

Whenever this article was written by Philaster, it tends greatly to wipe off some aspersions which were cast upon the Priscillianists. Their distinguishing character was not licentiousness, but rigour and abstinence: this was their profession, this their outward appearance; and thereby they gained upon many people. If this article of Philaster was written soon after the rise of Priscillianism, and before the trial of Priscillian at Treves, (which may be reckoned very probable) it confirms the conjecture mentioned some while ago; that the charges brought against him were first invented about that time.

The only two articles imputed to these Abstinents by Philaster, are their rigid doctrines about marriage and diet. These, as I apprehend, first induced men to call them Manichees: and having once given them that denomination, or said that they were a branch of the Gnostics and Manichees, men were led to ascribe to them all the enormities, which were generally imputed to those people.

XII. Upon the whole, from what has passed before us in this chapter, I think it appears, that the Priscillianists received the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which were generally received by other Christians. They likewise made use

ait: *Qui dimiserit uxorem suam sine causa criminis, facit eam machari.* [ib. ver. 9.] Aliud est itaque consensu communi hoc fieri, laudis causa majoris consequendæ a Domino, et aliud contra legem suadere, contraque amborum facere voluntatem. Et iterum: *Qui non manducat, manducantem non spernat: et qui manducat, non manducantem non judicat.* [Rom. xiv. 3.] Quod ex voluntate est itaque, laudis est amplioris immo potius mercedis cælestis est desiderium. Quod autem extra legem est, non a Deo Christo est traditum, sed inani hominum præsumptione et errore inventum. Scriptum est enim: *Do vobis omnia edere, sicut fecimus.* [Gen. ix. 3.] Hoc autem ideo faciunt, ut eccles paulatim spernentes, dicant

cas non esse bonas, et ita non a Deo hominibus eccles causa fuisse concessas: sed a Diabolo factas ut adferant, ita sentiunt. Inque hoc jam creaturam non a Deo creatam, sed a Diabolo eam factam prædicare nituntur. Perque hoc mendacium multorum animas captivarunt. Philast. H. 84. Abstinentes.

^z Persecutum vero est a Philastrio perstringi Priscillianistas, qui circa A. C. 380. proferre se cœperunt. Fabric. annot. in Philast. p. 161.

^a Si les heretiques qu' il nomme Abstinens sont les Priscillianistes, comme il y a assez d'apparence, il n'a écrit, qu' apres l' an 380. auquel cette heresie commença à éclater dans l'Espagne. S. Philastre. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. viii.

of apocryphal books; but what respect they had for them cannot be now clearly determined. Some ecclesiastics, who went under this denomination, are represented, from an ill-judged zeal and without sufficient reason, to have deserted their stations in the church, to betake themselves to a retired and solitary course of life. They had errors concerning the soul, and some other matters. They seem to have had a disadvantageous opinion of marriage, and thereby sometimes made unhappy breaches in families, if their adversaries do not aggravate. They also had rules about diet, not founded in reason, nor scripture. Some of these people are blamed for not consuming the eucharist at church: and they were irregular in fasting, when other Christians feasted. But as we have none of their writings remaining, we do not know their whole system with certainty. By some they have been charged with obscene doctrines, and lewd practices. But so far as we are able to judge upon the evidence that has been produced, they rather appear to have made high pretensions to sanctity and purity, and to have practised uncommon mortifications.

C H A P. CVIII.

DIODORUS, BISHOP OF TARSUS.

DIODORUS, of ^a a good family, and probably born at Antioch, in which city he long resided, was ordained bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia by ^b Meletius bishop of Antioch about the year 378. He died in 394, or sooner.

2. St. Jerom, whom ^c I place below, reckons the time when he was presbyter the most shining period of his life. He does not assign the reasons of that judgment: but they may be collected from other writers, particularly the ecclesiastical historians of those times.

3. Diodorus, whilst presbyter, seems to have had the direction of some monastery, or school, in, or near the city of Antioch.

^a Καὶ τὴν μὲν τὴ γένος ἀκλόιστο περι-
φαικται, τὴν δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ταλαιπω-
ρίαν ἀσπασίως ὑπέμεινε. Theod. H. E. l.
iv. c. 25. p. 188. B.

^b Ib. l. v. c.
4. in.

^c Diodorus, Tarsensis Epif-
copus, dum Antiochiæ esset Presbyter,

magis claruit. Extantque ejus in Aposto-
lum commentarii, et multa alia, ad Eusebii
magis Emiseni characterem pertinentia:
cujus cum sensum secutus sit, eloquentiam
imitari non potuit propter ignorantiam sæ-
cularium literarum. De V. l. cap. 119.

At^d which time he instructed divers young men in the knowledge of the scriptures, and the principles of religion: among whom three, who were afterwards very eminent, are particularly mentioned; Maximus bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, Theodore bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, and John Chrysostom bishop of Constantinople. Chrysostom in an oration calls Diodorus^e his father, and boasts of the share he had in his esteem.

4. Moreover, Jerom may have an eye to some sufferings, which he underwent from the Arians in the time of Valens: whereas his episcopate was peaceable. Chrysostom says, he^f was more than once banished from his native country, for his freedom in speaking the truth. Theodoret, in divers places, celebrates Diodorus's courage in those difficult times. He says, 'that^g when Leontius was bishop of Antioch, he and^h Flavian, though they were then but laymen, not only openlyⁱ professed the apostolical doctrine, but were also very diligent^j in keeping the people in the right faith. He elsewhere calls^k them^l lights of the truth.'

To these, and some other like things, Jerom may refer.

5. Jerom says farther, that 'Diodorus wrote Commentaries^m upon St. Paul's Epistles, and many other things, imitatingⁿ the manner of Eusebius of Emesa;' of whom, it may be remembered, we spake^o formerly. To the like purpose^p Socrates, and^q Sozomen: who say, that Diodorus wrote many books, representing the literal or historical sense of scripture, omitting the mystery.

6. I formerly^r had occasion to take notice of Diodorus's work against the Manichees, in five and twenty books, of which there is mention made in^s Photius. The same learned critic mentions a book of Diodorus^t concerning the Spirit, and^u gives a large account of his work against Fate, in eight books, and three and fifty chapters.

^d Την καὶ αὐτὴν ἐν υἱοῖς [Ἰωάννης, Διοδώρος, καὶ Μαξιμὸς] σπουδαῖοι περὶ τὴν ἀρίστην γινόμενοι, μαθητεύσαντες εἰς τὰ ἀσκητικά Διοδώρῳ καὶ χαρίῳ^o οἵτινες τότε μὲν ἀσκητικῶς προεβίβον. Socr. l. vi. c. 3. p. 302. B. Et Conf. Soz. l. viii. c. 2. p. 757. A. Et Thdr. l. v. c. ult.

^e In Diod. T. iii. p. 748. A.

^f Ἀλλὰ καὶ υἱὸς πολλῆς τῆς πατρὸς ἐξετίθει δια τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως πάρεσησιν. Ibid. p. 749. B.

^g — Ἡ δὲ ἀξιαστάτος ξυνορία φλαβιανὸς καὶ Διοδώρος, Ἰερὰς μὲν λαίλαψας μὴδεὶν τέλχη καὶ, τῶν δὲ λαῶν συνήθειαι

μοι, νυκτὶ καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν εἰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας ζήλον διηγεῖσθαι ἀπαύτως. Theod. L. ii. c. 24. p. 107. A. B. Vid. et l. iv. cap. 25.

^h — οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας φωτιστοί. L. iv. c. 27. p. 190. c.

ⁱ See p. 128, 129.

^k — πολλὰ βιβλία συνήραψεν, ψάλλον τῶν γραμμάτων τῶν Θεῶν προσεχὴν γραφῶν, τὰς διωρίας αὐτῶν ἐκτρέπομενος. Socr. l. vi. c. 3. p. 302. C.

^l Soz. l. viii. c. 2. p. 257. A. ^m Vol. iii. p. 384, 394.

ⁿ Cod. 85. p. 204.

^o Cod. 102. ^p Cod. 223. p. 662. &c.

^q p. 275.

7. By Theodoret we are assured, that^a Diodorus wrote against Paul of Samosata, Sabellius, Marcellus, and Photinus.

8. Suidas^r says, ' that Diodorus lived in the time of Julian and Valens; and adds, as from Theodore the reader, that he wrote Commentaries upon all the books of the Old Testament, Genesis, Exodus, and the books following, and upon the Psalms, and the four books of the Kingdoms, and the difficult places of the Chronicles, and upon the Proverbs: the^s difference between theory and allegory: upon Ecclesiastes: upon the Canticles: upon the Prophets — ' upon the four Gospels: upon the Acts of the Apostles: upon the epistle of the evangelist John: — Against the Melchisedechians: against the Jews: of the resurrection of the dead: of^a the soul, and the different opinions about it — of Providence: against^s Plato, concerning God, and the gods: of nature and matter: against the Astronomers and Astrologers, and of fate: of^r God, and the fictitious matter of the Greeks, or Gentiles — against the philosopher Euphronius, by way of question and answer: — against Porphyry of animals and sacrifices: and divers others, which need not to be here rehearsed.

9. Ebedjesu, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers found in the Syriac language, says, That Diodorus^s wrote sixty books, which the Arians had burned. However he mentions eight, which had remained, having escaped the diligence of his enemies; one of which is the work against the Manichees; another is an explication of a part of St. Matthew's gospel.

10. One book, in Suidas, and which may be supposed to relate to the right interpretation of scripture, is entitled ' The difference between theory and allegory.' In the enumeration of his works, it is placed, as we have seen, next after the Commentary upon the book of the Proverbs; and^s therefore may have been a Dissertation subjoined to it. But the design of it is not very obvious. Fabricius thinks, it^b shewed the difference of the mystical sense from the allegorical and moral. Ludolf Kuster, in his notes upon Suidas, says, that^c theory

^a Hæret. Fab. l. ii. cap. xi.

^r V. Διοδώρος.

^s Τις διαφορα

διακριτας και αλληγοριας.

^t Εις τα

δ' ευαγγελια' εις τας πραξεις των αποστολων'

εις την επιστολην Ιωαννη το ευαγγελιστη.

Ibid.

^u Περὶ ψυχης' καὶ διαφο-

ρων περὶ αὐτῆς αἰρεσιων.

^x Καὶ α

Πλάτωνος περὶ Θεου και θεων.

^y Περὶ θεων και υλης ελληνικης περιπλασ-

μενης.

^z Composuit libros numero

sexaginta, quos Ariani combusserunt —

Remanserunt vero ex illis quæ sequuntur

—et Expositio in partem Matthæi. Ebed.

Cat. n. 18. ap. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 39.

^a ' In Proverbia: ' cui addidit dissertati-

onem de ' differentia theoriæ et allego-

riæ, ' sive sensus mystici ab allegorico atque

moralī. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 368.

^b See note ^z.

^c Θεωρια hic fig-

nificat sensum abstrusorem et mysticum:

denotes

denotes the abstruse and mystical sense in opposition to the literal sense: and moreover, that the theory is more sublime than the allegory.

11. Diodorus seems to have been an apologist for the Christian religion. He wrote, as we have seen, against the Jews, as well as against heretics. And it may be reckoned very probable, that in some of his works he confuted heathenism, or some of its principles: it may be fairly argued from the titles of several of them above-mentioned from Suidas. And, if Facundas may be relied upon, the emperor Julian wrote a letter to Photinus, in^d which he reviled Diodorus, as ignorant of the mysteries of the gods, but well versed in the fishermen's theology; a large part of which letter Facundus has left us in a sad Latin translation.

12. The respect shewn to Diodorus appears, in part, in some things already said.

13. Theodoret^e speaks of him in terms of the highest respect, and often commends him. Basil, who was acquainted with Diodorus, testifies^f his esteem and affection for him, as an excellent and useful man. They who are pleased, may also consult^g Facundus.

14. Many learned moderns have been very sensible of his merit. Cave^h speaks honourably of his method of interpreting scripture. And as he imitated Eusebius of Emesa, so, as it seems, toⁱ him we are indebted for Chrysostom and Theodore, whose taste was formed by his. I place in the margin a part^k

cui opponitur το ῥητορ, sive sensus literalis. Sozomenus de Diodoro nostro:—περὶ δὲ το ῥητορ τῶν ἱερῶν λέγων τὰς ἐξηγήσεις ποιήσασθαι, τὰς θεωρίας ἀποφεινόμενα: id est: 'Quem accepi multos libros a se conscriptos posteris reliquisse, et sacram scripturam ad litteram exposuisse, omisso sensu mystico.' Et Socrates:—ψιλλῶ τῶ γραμματικῇ τῶν Θεῶν προσεχὼν γράφων, τὰς θεωρίας αὐτῶν ἐκρίπτωμενος. Diodorus vero — multos conscripsit libros, simplicem tantum atque obvium scripturarum sensum inquirens, mysticam vero earum interpretationem refugiens. Θεωρία igitur quid significet, hinc patet. Ab ea differt allegoria, quod hæc in inferioribus subsistat, nec in tam sublimi argumento versetur, quam theoria. Kuster.

^d Julianus enim Christo perfidus Imperator sic Photino hæresiarchæ adversus Diodorum scribit. — Diodorus autem Nazaræi Magus, — acutus apparuit Sophista religionis aggressis — usque adeo ignorans Paganorum mysteria, omnemque miserabiliter imbibens,

ut aiunt, degenerum et imperitorum ejus theologorum piscatorum errorem. Facund. l. iv. cap. 2. p. 59.

^e Καὶ Διοδόρος μὲν ο σοφιστὸς τε καὶ ἀνδρείολος, οἷα τις Πλάτωνος διδῶνς τε καὶ μέλας, τοῖς μὲν οἰκείοις τὴν ἀρδίαν προσηφέρει, τὰς δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν βλασφημίας ἐπιχλύζει. Theod. l. iv. c. 25. p. 188. B. Vid. et l. v. cap. ult. ^f Bas. Ep. 244. al. 82. p. 378. D. ^g Fac. l. iv. c. 2.

^h Vir sane undequaque doctissimus, qui in indagando S. Scripturarum sensu, repudiatis allegoriis, simplicem duntaxat atque obviam verborum intelligentiam sectatus est. Cav. H. L. T. i. in Diodoro.

ⁱ Præcipuus Diodori labor fuit, quo plerosque Scripturæ libros interpretando imitatus est Eusebium Emesenum. Atque ipse prævit Joanni Chrysostomo atque Theodoro Mopsuesteno, ita ut sensum literalem potius quam ex recepto apud plerosque alios illis temporibus more allegorias lectarentur. &c. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 362. ^k Je ne say, si Theodore

of Beaufobre's character of our Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. 'He calls them two of the most learned bishops of antiquity: both which, as he says, banished from their Commentaries allegorical interpretations, confining themselves to the literal sense. The loss of their works has been a great detriment to the Christian interest. But the Greeks sacrificed them to their hatred and envy, because Nestorius had been their scholar.'

15. The usefulness of Diodorus's Commentaries, if they had been extant, may be collected from what Montfaucon says: That 'from the remaining fragments of them, to be found in the Chains, he appears to have been well acquainted with Origen's Hexapla.

16. I have allowed myself to enlarge in the history of Diodorus, and his works, because they are most of them lost, and many of them were designed for illustrating the holy scriptures. But for farther accounts of them, and the reflections cast upon his and Theodore's memory, after the rise of the Nestorian and Pelagian controversies, I refer to other^m writers; though I have made some use of them, and have been assisted by them in composing this article.

C H A P. CIX.

A COMMENTARY UPON THIRTEEN OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

I. *The time and author of this work.* II. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament.*

I. I HAVE already more than once^a taken notice of a Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, usually joined with St. Ambrose's works, and of late ascribed by many to Hilary deacon of Rome.

de Mopsueste, et Diodore de Tarfe, deux des plus savans Evêques de l' Antiquité, découvrirent cette vue des loix Mosaiques: [pour être un preservatif contre l'idolatrie:] mais ils bannirent, l'un et l'autre, de leurs commentaires sur la V. T. tout ce fatras d' allegories, s' attachant uniquement à bien expliquer le sens literal. Quelle perte pour l' Eglise que celle le leurs excellens ouvrages, que les Grecs ont sacrifié à leur haine et leur envie, parce que ces savans hommes avoient été les maitres de Nesto-

rius. Beauf. H. de Manich. l. i. ch. iv. T. i. p. 288.

¹ Diodorus Tarsensis, in sacra Scriptura apprime versatus, Hexaplorum plenam notitiam habuisse videtur: ut ex ejus fragmentis, quæ in Catenis supersunt,prehenditur. Montf. Prælim. in Hexapl. Orig. p. 95.

^m Vid. Cav. H. L. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 358—363. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. viii. et Du Pin. T. ii.

^a See Vol. iii. p. 155. 415.

1. And

1. And as I have not yet given any account of him, I shall do it now, but briefly. He^b was born in Sardinia, and made deacon of Rome about the year 354. He is mentioned by Jerom in his book of Ecclesiastical Writers, in the chapter concerning^c Lucifer of Cagliari, and several times in his book against the Luciferians. Hilary was always a zealous Homöusian. Afterwards he became a rigid Luciferian, and even exceeded the bishop, from whom those people received their denomination. Jerom^d pleasantly calls him another Deucalion, as if he would bring again an universal deluge on the world, because he was for rebaptizing Arians, and other heretics, when they came over to the church: whereas it had been the general usage of Christians in former times, and of the church of Rome in particular, to receive heretics upon repentance. Upon the ground of this notion Hilary separated from the church. He also wrote treatises in favour of his opinion. So says Jerom.

2. Cave readily allows this Hilary, deacon of Rome, to be author of the fore-named Commentary, written, as he supposeth, before 384, as also of Quæstiones in Vetus et Novum Testamentum, written about 370, and usually joined with^e St. Augustine's works. Pagi^f likewise contends, that Hilary, deacon of Rome, was author of both these works. Du Pin^g carefully examines this point. Tillemont says: It^h is now thought by many, that Hilary is author of the fore-mentioned Commentary: but that this opinion is not without its difficulties. James Basnage, without determining who is the author, says, heⁱ lived in the time of Damasus, before the end of the fourth century. Samuel Basnage^k hesitates. And as for the Quæstiones, &c. he will not deny them to have the same author with the Commentaries, because they agree in several

^b Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 317.

^c De V. I. cap. 95.

^d Est præterea aliud quod inferemus, adversum quod ne mutire audeat Hilarius, Deucalion orbis. Si enim hæretici baptismum non habent, et ideo rebaptizandi ab Ecclesia sunt, quia in Ecclesia non fuerunt, ipse quoque Hilarius non est Christianus. In ea quippe Ecclesia baptizatus est, quæ semper ab hæreticis baptismum recepit.—Diaconus eras, o Hilari, et a Manichæis baptizatos recipiebas. Diaconus eras, et Ebionis baptismum comprobabas. Repente, postquam exortus est Arius, totus tibi displicere cœpisti. Segregas te cum tuis vernulis, et novum balneum aperis.—Quod si negandum quispiam putaverit, hæreticos

a majoribus nostris semper fuisse susceptos, legat beati Cypriani epistolæ.—Legat et ipsius Hilarii libellos, quos adversus nos de hæreticis rebaptizandis edidit: et ibi reperiet, ipsum Hilarium confiteri, a Julio, Marco, Silvestro, et cæteris veteribus Episcopis similiter in poenitentiam omnes hæreticos susceptos. Hieron. Adv. Lucifer. T. iv. P. ii. p. 305. Vid. ib. p. 302. infr. m.

^e Tom. iii. edit. Lovan. T. iv. edit. Benedic.

^f Ann. 362. n. xxv. xxvi.

^g Bib. Ec. T. ii. ^h St. Ambroise.

art. xci. Mem. Ec. T. x. et Lucifer de

Cagliari Art. ix. et not. 9, 10. Mem. T. vii.

ⁱ Histoire de l'Eglise. l. xix. ch. 7. n.

15. p. 1181. ^k Ann. 362. n. 21, 22.

things.

things. But¹ he says, they are written in a manner much inferior to the commentaries. None, in my opinion, have treated this question more fully, or more judiciously, than the Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose's works: they say, that^m the manuscript copies of the commentaries are very different from one another; and that in some parts of those commentaries there appear to be interpolations of long passages. Nor are they certain, that the Quæstiones were written by the author of the commentaries. And if they were, they also have been interpolated: which indeed, I take to be very probable, or even manifest, concerning both these works.

II. I shall make some extracts out of the commentaries; but I forbear to transcribe any thing out of the Quæstiones in V. et N. Testamentum.

1. In these Commentaries upon thirteen epistles of St. Paul, most books of the Old and New Testament are quoted: as the four gospels, Mark'sⁿ in particular; the Acts of the apostles very often; the first and^o second epistle of Peter; St. John's first epistle often, his^p third epistle once at least; the^q Revelation he ascribes to John the apostle, and quotes it very freely: whether the author received the epistle to the Hebrews, as Paul's, may be questioned; since he wrote commentaries upon his acknowledged thirteen epistles, and not upon that. However, the epistle to the Hebrews is mentioned in^r these commentaries.

2. I shall now put down some remarkable observations and explications of this author.

3. He says, that^s all the apostles were chosen out of the Jewish nation, and that it was fit it should be so.

4. Upon Gal. i. 19. he says, that^t James, there mentioned, and called *brother of the Lord*, was son of Joseph by a former

¹ Commentarius porro operi Quæstionum longissime præstat. Ib. n. 22.

^m In Commentar. Admonit. ap. S. Ambrosii Opp. T. ii. in Append. p. 21. &c.

ⁿ Quamvis dicat Marcus Evangelista de demonibus: *Sciebant enim Christum ipsum esse Jesum.* [Marc. i. 34.] In 1 ep. ad Cor. cap. ii. 8. Ap. Ambrosii. T. ii. Append. p. 118. D.

^o Sicut Petrus Apostolus inter cætera dicens: *Ut sitis, inquit, confortes divinæ naturæ.* [2 Pet. i. 4.] In Philip. i. p. 251. F.

^p Hic est Caius, ut arbitror, ad quem scribit Joannes Apostolus exultans in caritate ejus, quam exhibebat fraternitati. In Rom. xvi. p. 110. E.

^q Sicut dictum est in

Apocalypsi Joannis Apostoli. In 2 Thess. c. ii. p. 286. C. Vid. et in 2 Cor. xii. p. 198. B. in 1 Thess. iv. p. 282. A. Et passim.

^r Nam simili modo et in epistola ad Hebræos scriptum est, quia Levi, qui decimas accepit, decimas dedit Melchisedec. In 2 Tim. i. p. 305. B.

^s Hoc est quod dicit, quia dispensatio prædicationis his decreta est a Deo, qui ex Judæis crediderunt in Christum. Unde nullus ex Gentibus ad Apostolatam electus est. Dignum enim erat, ex his eligi prædicatores, qui ante speraverunt salutem, quæ illis promissa est in Christo. In Eph. i. ver. 11, 12. p. 233. B.

^t In Galat. i. p. 213. F.

wife: but some impiously asserted, that Joseph had children by Mary.

5. He supposeth, that ^a the Christians at Rome had no apostle with them, before the time of St. Paul's writing to them; which to me appears very probable: it may be argued from the whole of his epistle to them, though from some parts of it more especially. However, Pelagius manifests a different opinion in ^z his commentary upon that epistle.

6. Upon Col. iv. 14. *Luke the beloved physician and Demas greet you*: he says, 'That ^y Luke was justly dear to Paul, because he constantly accompanied him. Moreover, he is ^x said to have written the gospel and the Acts of the apostles.' Which manner of expression, seems to intimate some doubt about the truth of that tradition; or, whether Luke here mentioned, and called physician, was the evangelist.

7. He supposeth ^z the epistle, called to the Ephesians, to have been written to them.

8. The translation of Col. iv. 16. followed by him, is ^a *that ye read the epistle of the Laodiceans*. The same is in ^b the commentary ascribed to Pelagius. Which expression I take to be ambiguous: it may import an epistle written by the Laodiceans; or an epistle which was their property, as having been written to them. In which of those two senses Pelagius understood the expression, does not appear: but this author, I think, understood it in the latter sense; and supposed, that hereby was meant a letter sent to the Laodiceans by the apostle. Since, therefore, he allowed the epistle, called to the Ephesians, to have been written to them; and that there was an epistle sent to the Laodiceans, mentioned Col. iv. 16, he must have looked upon this as a lost epistle. For it does not appear, that there was any epistle of the apostle Paul received by him, which was inscribed to the Laodiceans.

^a Romanis autem [ut Galatis] irasci non debuit, sed et laudare fidem illorum: quia nulla insignia virtutum videntes, nec aliquem Apostolorum, susceperant fidem Christi, ritu licet Judaico. Proleg. in ep. ad Rom. p. 25. B.

^x Romanos Petri prædicatione fidem tenentes confirmare se velle Paulus dicit: non quo minus acceperant a Petro, sed ut duobus Apostolis testibus atque doctoribus, eorum roboretur fides. Pelag. in Rom. i. 11. Ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 927.

^y Vere carissimus Apostolo fuit Lucas, quia omnia postponens Apostolum semper sequutus est. Qui et

Evangelium et Actus Apostolorum scripsisse perhibetur. In Col. p. 276. C.

^z Vid. Proleg. in ep. ad Eph. et Comm. in c. i. v. 1.

^a Et vos ut eam, quæ est Laodicensium legatis.] Quia generales sunt Apostolorum, et ad omnium profectum ecclesiarum scriptæ epistolæ:—idecirco, etiam Laodicensibus epistolam hanc legi præcepit, ut per hanc quid agendum sibi esset addiscerent: et Colossenses ut eorum legereat, juxta sensum supradictum. In Col. iv. p. 276. D.

^b Et ea, quæ Laodicensium est, vobis legatur. Pelag. in Col. ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 1076.

9. The first epistle to the Thessalonians is inscribed in this manner: *Paul, and Silvanus, and Timothy, to the church of the Thessalonians.* Upon which the author observes: 'The letter has the names of three bishops, [or of bishops, without three,] but the sense and words are the apostle's alone.' A somewhat like observation may be seen in Pelagius's Commentary upon the beginning of the first epistle to the Corinthians. And it is very just. All the authority of the epistle is derived from the apostolical character and commission.

10. His reading at 1 Tim. iii. 16. is * *Which was manifested in the flesh.* That must have been in many Latin copies at that time.

11. In the note upon Tit. iii. 13. he makes no question, but that Zenas was a Jewish lawyer: which appears to me very probable, though then a Christian.

C H A P. CX.

PHILASTER, BISHOP OF BRESCIA.

I. ACCORDING to Cave^a Philaster, bishop of Brixia, or Brescia, in Italy, and author of a work Concerning Heresies, flourished about the year 380. Tillemont likewise^b thinks it probable, that the forementioned work must have been written in the year 380, or soon after. Fabricius not only thinks, that^c Philaster wrote after Epiphanius, but that he also borrowed from him: which does not appear certain to me. Some few instances of agreement between authors, who have the same design, will not amount to a full proof. If Philaster had read Epiphanius, in all probability he would have mentioned him. It needs not to be reckoned at all strange, if he was wholly unacquainted with Epiphanius's work, even supposing him not to have written before 380, or somewhat later, which is not certain. Augustine, long after that, had seen

^a Trium quidem Episcoporum nomina literæ continent. [Al. Episcoporum nomine literæ continentur.] Sed sensus et verba solius Apostoli sunt. In 1 Thess. p. 277. A.

^d Et Sophenes frater.] Frater, inquit, non Apostolus. Hunc autem idcirco secum scribentem inducit, quia ex ipsis doctor est, et pro his valde sollicitus. Pelag. in 1 Cor. ap. S. Hieron. T. v. p. 974.

* p. 296. B.

^f Quamvis enim Zenam Legisperitum vocitet, Apollo tamen perfectus erat in Scripturis. Sed quia Zenas hujus professionis fuerat in synagoga, sic illum appellat. In Tit. iii. p. 317. A.

^a Hist. Lit. T. i.

lastre Mem. Ec. T. 8.

^c Etiam ante Philastrium scripsit Epiphanius, ex cujus libris ille profecit. Fabric. Not. ad Vit. Philast. per Gaudentium.

^b See S. Philastre Mem. Ec. T. 8.

^c Etiam

only the Summary or Synopsis of Epiphanius, as all allow. Philaster is often quoted by Augustine in his book of Heresies. It may not be amiss to put down^d a passage of Augustine in his letter to *Quod vult deus* concerning that work, in which he gives the preference to Epiphanius above Philaster. The year of Philaster's death is not certainly^e known; but it is generally supposed, that^f he died in 386, or 387.

2. Philaster has a catalogue of the books of scripture: which, omitting some things relating to apocryphal writings, is to this purpose. 'It^g was appointed by the apostles, and their successors, that nothing should be read in the catholic church, but the law, and the prophets, and the gospels, and the Acts of the apostles, and thirteen epistles of Paul, and seven other, two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, and one of James, which seven are joined with the Acts of the apostles. But the hidden, that is, apocryphal scriptures, though they ought to be read by the perfect, for the improvement of men's manners, may not be read by all.'

3. In that article are omitted the epistle to the Hebrews, and the book of the Revelation. Nevertheless, perhaps, they are not quite rejected, but only denied to be publicly read. Let us therefore observe some other places.

4. The very next article relates to the epistle to the Hebrews, and is to this effect: 'There^h are others also, who do not allow the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews to be his: but say, it is either an epistle of Barnabas the apostle, or of Clement bishop of Rome. But others say, it is an epistle of Luke the evangelist. And some receive an epistle to the Laodiceans. Some pretend, that additions have been made to

^d Philastrius quidam Brixienſis epiſcopus, quem cum ſancto Ambroſio Mediolani etiam ipſe vidi, ſcripſit hinc librum — Neque enim putandum eſt, aliquas ignoraffe Epiphanius, quas noverat Philaſtrius: cum Epiphanius longe Philaſtrio doctiorem invenerimus. Epiſt. 222. T. ii.

^e See St. Philaſter in Tillemont, near the end. ^f Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. et Baſnag. ad ann. 386. n. x.

^g Propter quod ſtatutum eſt ab Apoſtoliſ, et eorum ſucceſſoribus, non aliud legi in eccleſia debere catholica, niſi Legem, et Prophetas, et Evangelia, et Actus Apoſtolorum, et Pauli tredecim epiſtolas, et ſeptem alias, Petri duas, Joannis tres, Judæ unam, et unam Jacobi, quæ ſeptem Actibus Apoſtolorum conjunctæ ſunt. Scripturæ autem abſconditæ, id eſt, apocrypha,

eſſi legi debent. morum cauſa a perfectis, non ab omnibus legi debent. Phil. de Hæ. cap. 88.

^h Sunt alii quoque, qui epiſtolam Pauli ad Hebræos non adſerunt eſſe ipſius, ſed dicunt, aut Barnabæ eſſe Apoſtoli, aut Clementis de urbe Roma epiſcopi. Alii autem Lucæ Evangeliſtæ aiunt. Epiſtolam etiam ad Laodiceſes ſcriptam. Et quia addiderunt in ea quædam non recte ſentientes, inde non legitur in eccleſia, eſſi legitur a quibuſdam. Non tamen in eccleſia legitur populo, niſi tredecim epiſtolæ ipſius, et ad Hebræos interdictum. Et in ea quia rhetorice ſcripſit, ſermonis plauſibili. Inde non putant eſſe ejuſdem Apoſtoli. Et quia et factum Chriſtum dicit in ea, inde non legitur. De penitentia autem propter Novatianos æque. Ibid. cap. 89.

it by some heterodox persons, and that for that reason, it ought not to be read in the churches, though it is read by some. But in the church are read to the people his thirteen epistles only, and that to the Hebrews sometimes. Moreover, some reject it as more eloquent than the apostle's other writings: and because Christ is here said to be *made*: and because of what he says of ^k repentance, which the Novatians make an advantage of.

A part of this chapter was alleged ^l formerly.

5. By this we perceive, that there were at that time not a few, who on one account or other had doubts about the writer of this epistle, which has not St. Paul's name at the beginning, as his other epistles have. The objection taken from the superior elegance of the style of this epistle above the rest deserves notice. It affords an argument, that the ancient Christians read the scriptures with care. How Origen expresseth himself upon this head, we saw ^m formerly.

6. Philaster himself received the epistle to the Hebrews; for he reckons it a heresy to reject it. And in the remaining part of the chapter, just cited, he proposeth answers to the two last-mentioned objections. And in this his work, of Heresies, he has ⁿ several times referred to this epistle, or quoted it as the apostle Paul's.

7. Philaster received likewise the book of the Revelation. For one of his heresies is that ^o of those who reject the gospel of John and his Revelation. I put that article at the bottom of the page; where he observes, there are some who dare to say, that the Revelation is not a writing of John the apostle and evangelist, but of Cerinthus.

8. I do not think it needful to make any more remarks upon these articles, nor to transcribe any more chapters of this author. But it hence appears, that he received the same books of the New Testament which we do. If ever we come to that part of this work, which is allotted for the history of the heretics of the first two centuries, we shall have occasion to take farther notice of Philaster.

ⁱ Hebr. iii. 2. ^k Hebr. vi. 4. and x. 26. ^l See Vol. iii. p. 244. ^m See Vol. ii. p. 467. ⁿ Cum Apostolus doceat, quod omnem hominem mori oportet, postque hoc jam judicari. cap. 122. p. 255. Vid. Hebr. ix. 27. Et honorandæ nuptiæ. cap. 117. p. 239. A. Vid. Hebr. xiii. 4. ^o Post hos sunt hæretici, qui Evangelium secundum Joannem, et Apocalypsim ipsius non accipiunt: et cum

non intelligunt virtutem Scripturæ, nec desiderant discere, in hæresi permanent pereuntes: ut etiam Cerinthus illius hæretici esse audeant dicere, et Apocalypsim ibidem non beati Joannis Evangelistæ et Apostoli, sed Cerinthus hæretici, qui tunc ab Apostolis beatis hæreticus manifestatus, abjectus est ab ecclesia. Hier. 60. p. 120, 121. Et Conf. Fabricii, not. (b).

C H A P. CXI.

GAUDENTIUS, BISHOP OF BRESCIA.

1. GAUDENTIUS, successor of Philaster in the bishopric of Brescia, is placed by Cave at the year 387. For a more particular account of him, and his works, I refer to ^a others. I shall only take his testimony to the books of the New Testament, and some select passages.

2. He expressly says, there ^b are four evangelists; and he has frequently quoted all the four gospels, St. Mark's ^c in particular.

3. The ^d book of the Acts of the apostles is expressly quoted, and ascribed to St. Luke, who had also written a gospel.

4. I need not produce any particular quotations of St. Paul's epistles. I only observe, that ^e he has several times quoted the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's.

5. Gaudentius takes but little notice of the catholic epistles. However, he has quoted ^f the epistle of St. James, and ^g the first epistle of St. Peter. And, very probably, he received all the rest.

6. He likewise quotes ^h the book of the Revelation.

7. There is no notice taken by Gaudentius of any apocryphal Christian books. And it is likely, that his canon of the New Testament was the same with that now generally received.

8. It appears, that ⁱ Gaudentius was wont to compare the Latin and Greek copies of the New Testament, or the Latin translation with the Greek original. And as he had travelled in the East, it is not improbable, that he was well skilled in the Greek language.

^a Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 282. Du Pin. Bib. T. iii. Tillem. Mem. T. x.

^b In quatuor Evangelistarum Testimonio. Ap. Bib. P. P. T. v. p. 947. A.

^c Vid. p. 950. F. 951. G.

^d Sicut in principis Actuum Apostolorum Lucas Evangelista testatur. p. 950. A. Lucas Evangelista, qui beatos Apostolos pari merito subsequutus est, et Evangelii librum et Actus Apostolorum imitanda examinatione conscripsit. p. 969. C.

^e Sicut scriptura testatur in epistola Pauli beatissimi ad Hebræos, p. 975. G. et passim. ^f p. 972. F. ^g p. 960. C.

^h Et sicut in Apocalypsi de Babylone

scribitur, vel urbe, vel gente, vel unaquaque anima, errorum caligine, vitiisque carnalium permixtione confusa. [Apoc. c. xvii. ver. 6.] p. 943. C. et alibi.

ⁱ ——— dicens: Nunc judicium est hujus mundi. Nunc hujus mundi princeps mittetur deorsum, sive, expelletur foras, ut in Græcis exemplaribus legimus. [Joh. xii. 31.] p. 969. B.

Sine, inquit, eam, sive finite. Utrumque enim et in Græcis et Latinis exemplaribus invenitur. Sed magis congruere videtur sensui, cum legitur. Sinite, &c. [Conf. Marc. xiv. 6. Joh. xii. 7.] p. 964. A.

9. He has divers good observations upon Christ's shewing himself to Thomas, and takes notice * of the advantage which we have from the scrupulousness of that apostle, in the fuller evidence of our Lord's resurrection.

10. Gaudentius supposed¹ our Lord's ministry to have been of but one year's duration only from his baptism to his death.

11. He often speaks^m of the Lord's-day, or the first day of the week, sanctified by Christ's resurrection from the dead.

12. He asserts free-will very strongly. He says, 'Thatⁿ things are not done, because they were foretold: but the Divine prescience knows before hand what will happen, and therefore they are foretold. It is, he says, inconsistent with the perfections of God, that he should command, or compel men to do what he blames, if done. What the Jews did, they did voluntarily, though it had been foretold. And do you think, that if the Jews had repented at the preaching of Jesus, the world could not have been saved? I think we are not to limit the divine power or wisdom. *For who has known the mind of the Lord? or who has been his counsellor?* Consider, how in the gospel Christ waited for the repentance of the Jewish people, and how he upbraided the cities, in which most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not.'

13. Descanting upon the notice taken of the value of the ointment, with which Mary had anointed the Lord, as men-

* Sufficiat nobis, quoniam sancti Thomae curiositas et ambiguitas futurae scrupulositatis finem fecit. Quod enim absens fuit, quod avidius et videre et attestare Dominum perquisivit, totum nostrae procurabatur salutis, ut evidentius nosceremus resurrectionis Dominicae veritatem. p. 969. B.

¹ Anniculus est, quia post illud baptismum, quod pro nobis in Jordane suscepit, usque ad passionis suae diem unius anni tempus impletur. Et ea tantum scripta sunt in Evangeliiis, quae in illo anno vel docuit vel fecit. Nec ipsa tamen omnia. p. 948. H.

^m Nam sexta feria, quae hominem fecerat, pro eodem passus. Et die dominica, quae dicitur in scripturis prima sabbathi, in qua sumserat mundus exordium, resurrexit. p. 945. F. Vid. et p. 960. D. et 959. B.

ⁿ Synagoga Judaeorum, quod erat crudeliter factura, praedictum est: non ut fieret, iustum est. Nec ideo factum est, quia praedictum erat. Sed ideo praedictum est, quia

erat futurum: ut praescientiam suam Deus in his quae per libertatem arbitrii hominum futura erant, ostenderet. Libertatem diximus arbitrii, quia voluerunt Judaei facere quod fecerunt: et utique si voluissent, [si noluissent,] non fecissent. Certe ingentis sacrilegii est, vel cogitare quod Deus, qui non solum bonus et iustus, sed ipsa bonitas est et ipsa iustitia, vel jubeat aliquid vel cogat fieri quod factum damnet. An fortasse putamus, quia si poenituissent Israelitae, aliter omnipotens Filius Dei salvare non potuerit mundum? *Quis enim cognovit sensum Domini? aut quis consiliarius ejus fuit?* Considera in Evangelio, quomodo expectaverit Christus poenitentiam Judaeorum: ubi exprobat civitatibus, in quibus factae sunt plurimae virtutes ejus, quod non egerint poenitentiam. — Praescientia quidem Dei non fallitur. Sed nec homini concessa semel voluntatis libertas aufertur. &c. p. 948. F. G. Vid. et p. 963. B.

tioned John xii. 4, 5. he^s has some uncommon thoughts concerning our Saviour's treatment of Judas.

14. He^s seems to have read the decree of the council at Jerusalem, Acts xv. as we now have it. By *blood* he does not understand homicide, but the blood of animals. Moreover he says, there was no occasion to insert there a prohibition of homicide, adultery, and such great crimes, which were punished even by human laws, but only those particulars, *things offered to idols, blood, things strangled, and fornication*. If the reader pleases, he may recollect what was formerly^a said by us concerning the true reading of that place.

15. He^s asserts the reality of natural religion: and says, that by the exercise of their own reason men may learn the existence of God, and discern the obligation of an equitable conduct one toward another.

16. He^s celebrates the progress of the Christian religion, and the effects of it in turning men from darkness to light, and from vice to virtue and holiness.

17. I conclude my extracts with a pious observation of this writer: 'That' we are born again, that we know in part the works of God, that we endeavour to improve the time of this life, so as to obtain a better, that in the hope of future recompenses we act and speak religiously, is all owing to God: I say, it is owing to God.

^a Quamvis ergo Dominus Jesus conscientiae iudex esset, noluit tamen Judam de occultis ejus acius increpare, ne, quoniam verisimili ratione videbatur locutus, putaretur forsitan injuste correptus, atque hinc iracundiam ejus tantam concepisse causam, ut inimicis necandum traderet quem sine ullo peccamine habuisset insensum. Nihil ergo acerbum Christus voluit pro merito sceleratae mentis illius loqui, ne Judas eum tradere videretur iratus. &c. p. 964. D. E.

^p Et ideo beatus Jacobus cum ceteris Apostolis decretum tale constituit in ecclesiis observandum: *Ut abstineatis vos, inquit, ab immolatis, et a sanguine*, id est, *a suffocatis*. Prætermiserunt homicidium, adulterium, veneficia: quoniam nec nominari ea in ecclesiis oporteret, quæ legibus etiam Gentilium punirentur. Prætermiserunt quoque illas omnes minutias observationum legalium. Et sola hæc quæ prædiximus custodienda sanxerunt, ne vel sacrificatis diabolo cibis profanemur immundis, vel ne perituro per viscera suffocatorum animalium

sanguine polluamur, vel ne immunditiis fornicationum corpora nostra, quæ templa Dei sunt, violemus. p. 967. F. G.

^q See Vol. iii. p. 151—164.

^r Neque hodie aliquis reatum peccati incurrit, si eum non astringat aut naturalis lex, aut mandati lex, aut literæ lex. Naturalis lex est illa, quam Gentes legem literæ non habentes naturaliter ea quæ legis sunt faciunt: quia rationalis animæ humanæ natura, ut Creatorem suum sentiat, ut proximum non lædat, ut non faciat quod pati non vult, naturali quadam lege intelligit. &c. p. 960. F.

^s Nam priusquam pateretur et resurgeret Christus, notus erat tantum in Judæa Deus. Tunc in omnes gentes fulgor claritatis dominicæ pertransit — p. 948. C.

^t Nos ipsi etiam, quod renascimur, quod hæc ipsa opera Domini ex parte novimus, quod vivendo vitam quærimus, quod futurorum spem gerentes pie conversamur et loquimur, Dei, inquam, Dei sunt opera. p. 960. B.

C H A P. CXII.

S O P H R O N I U S.

1. As St. Jerom has placed his learned friend Sophronius in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, I transcribe the chapter^a below. And I likewise refer to some learned^b moderns, who have made observations upon it.

2. Jerom says, that Sophronius was a very learned man; that when young, he published a work entitled The praises of Bethlehem, and since, an excellent account of the Demolition of the temple of Serapis. He had also translated several of Jerom's works into Greek.

3. All those things are lost. But we have a Greek version of St. Jerom's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, called Sophronius's. But though many receive it as his, all do not. Its genuineness is denied, not only by^c Isaac Vossius, who thought it to have been made by Erasmus himself, who first published it, but^d by divers other learned men, who allow the antiquity of it.

4. Nevertheless, Robert Stephens and Mill have prefixed to the four gospels the several chapters or Lives of the four Evangelists, in that Greek version; and Mill, in like manner, the chapters of St. James and St. Jude to their epistles. He should have taken also the chapter concerning St. Paul, and have placed it before his epistle to the Romans. Why he omitted it, I do not know, unless he thought it too long. Moreover, these chapters, so far as taken, are in^e Stephens, and^f Mill, called Sophronius's. But, if I may be allowed to speak my

^a Sophronius, vir apprime eruditus, laudes Bethlehem adhuc puer, et nuper de subversione Serapis insignem librum composuit. De Virginitate quoque ad Eustochium, et Vitam Hillarionis monachi, opuscula mea, in Græcum eleganti sermone transtulit. Psalterium quoque, et Prophetas, quos nos de Hebræo in Latinum vertimus. De V. I. cap. 134.

^b Vid. Fabr. Bib. Ec. et Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 195—198. Cav. Hist. Lit. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. xii. St. Jerome, art. 39. et 58.

^c Vid. Voss. citat. a Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 295, 296.

^d Viro summo Isaaco Vossio facile largior, nec Sophronii illius, cui tribuitur,

nec valde antiquam esse Græcam Catalogi Hieronymiani versionem. Sed ut ab Erasmo, aut ab alio illius ævi confictam credam, adduci non possum. Nam cum ex eo quædam iisdem verbis in Lexico Suidæ legantur, potius est, ut Suida vetustiorē credam. Jo. Andr. Bosius Introductione in notitiam Script. Ec. cap. 3. citat a Fabr. Bib. Ec. p. 13.

Ac præterea Græcus Interpres, qui adscito Sophronii nomine vetustatem mentitur, eam fideliter exhibeat. C. A. Heumann. Præf. ad Lactant. Symph. p. v. Hannover. 1722.

^e Βίος — καὶ ἄλλα κατὰ Σωφρόνιον. Ap. Stephan.

^f Σωφρόνιος.

mind,

mind, it seems to me, that those articles had been better put in St. Jerom's own original Latin, even supposing, that the Greek version had been made by his friend Sophronius: but as that is not certain, the version is still less proper. I formerly² took the liberty to make remarks upon some of the testimonies prefixed by Mill to the gospels.

C H A P. CXIII.

THEODORE, BISHOP OF MOPSUESTIA IN CILICIA.

I. *His time and history.* II. *Accounts of his works, particularly of his commentaries, from Photius and others, and his testimony to the scriptures.* III. *A fragment concerning the four gospels, with remarks.* IV. *His character, as a preacher.* V. *Reflections upon him after his death.*

I. THEODORE was mentioned in the chapter of Diodorus of Tarsus. He was descended of an honourable family, and in all probability was a native of the city of Antioch. He^a was an intimate friend and fellow-disciple of John Chrysostom under Libanius the sophist, and Andragathius the philosopher, and afterwards under the fore-mentioned Diodorus and Carterius.

Sozomen says, that^b he was well skilled in the sacred scriptures, and in the liberal sciences of the rhetoricians and philosophers. Theodoret^c calls him the doctor of the whole church: he says, he was bishop six and thirty years, and wrote against all heresies, particularly those of Arius, Eunomius, and Apollinarius.

And, as according to Theodoret's account, Theodore died in 429, it is concluded, that^d he was ordained in 394. I do not therefore well know, why^e Cave placed him as flourishing about the year 407; when, too, he supposeth him to have been

^a See the chapter of Hippolytus. Vol. ii. p. 408, 409.

^b Μοψουστίας δι τῆς κίλικας Θεόδωρος,

αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν πρὶν βιβλίων, καὶ τῆς ἀλλῆς παιδείας ἐπὶ σοφῶν τε καὶ φιλοσοφῶν ἱκανὸς ὑπῆρκεν. Soz. l. viii. c. 2. p. 757. A. B.

^c — Θεόδωρος ὁ Μοψουστίας ἐπισκοπὸς, ὡς καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδασκαλὸς. κ. λ.

Thdr. l. v. c. ult.

^d Vid. Pagi Ann. 423. xvi. et 427. xii. Et Conf. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 400. not. 3.

^e Claruit anno 407. Quin si mortis ejus tempus recte assequor, jam ab anno 392 episcopatum tenuit. Obiisse enim videtur anno 428, postquam ecclesiam Mopsuestenam per 36 annos gubernasset. H. L. T. i. p. 385.

bishop so soon as 392. And indeed, there are others also, who think, he ^f was ordained bishop in 392, and died in 428.

Theodore ^g had a brother, named Polychronius, who presided with honour over the church of Apamea, and was distinguished by his agreeable manner of preaching, and the holiness of his life.

II. Photius has given an account of several of Theodore's works.

1. The first in order is ^h his Defence of Basil against Eunomius, consisting of five and twenty books. ' Though his style is not clear,' Photius says, ' he is full of sense and argument, and abounds with texts of scripture. He confutes Eunomius, almost word for word; and largely shews him to have had little skill in profane learning, and yet less in our theology.'

2. The next is a Commentary upon the book of Genesis. Here Photius says, that ⁱ Theodore studiously shuns allegorical interpretations, and confines himself to the history. He moreover says, that in this work may be perceived the principles of Nestorianism, though the author was before Nestorius.

3. The third ^k is a small volume in three books, against the Persian Magic, and shewing the preference of true religion. Here again Photius says, that the author favours Nestorianism.

4. The fourth and last is ^m ' a work in five books, against those who said, that men sin by nature, not by will and choice. He considers it as a doctrine held by those in the west, and from thence brought into the east, especially by an author, called Aram; who he is I do not know, who had written several books in defence of it. The opinions of that sect he represents in this manner. One of them is, that men sin by nature, not by choice. By nature, however, not meaning that, in which Adam was first formed; for that, they say, was good; but that which he afterwards had, when he had transgressed, being now bad instead of the good, and mortal instead of the immortal nature, which he before had. Hence men, being bad by nature, who before were good, now ⁿ sin by nature, not by choice. Another opinion of theirs, and consequent upon that is, that ^o infants, though

^f Vid. Basnag. Ann. 428. n. γ.

^g Thdr. ubi supra.

ⁱ Cod. 38. p. 24.

^k Βιβλιαριον—Cod. 81. p. 200.

^l Conf. Theod. de Mopf. art. 6. Tillem.

T. 12.

^m — προς τις χιςολας, μη απηλλαχθαι ημας.

φους και η γνημη πλαις τις ανθρωπος.

— Cod. 177. p. 396.

ⁿ — εν τη φους, και ου εν προαιρεσει κλησθαι την αμαρτιαν. Ib.

^o — μηδε τα παιδια, καν αβελιγνια η,

‘ newly born, are not free from sin; forasmuch as from Adam’s
 ‘ transgression a sinful nature, as they express it, is derived to
 ‘ all his posterity: for this they allege those words, *I was born*
 ‘ *in sin*, and others. Here also,’ as Photius proceeds, ‘ appear
 ‘ Nestorian principles, and the notion of Origen concerning
 ‘ the period of the punishments of the future state. He^p also
 ‘ says, that man was at first made mortal; though death be
 ‘ represented as the consequence of his transgression, the better
 ‘ to convince us of the evil of sin.’ Photius concludes that
 article, saying, ‘ that this writer appeared to have studied the
 ‘ scriptures with care, though in many things he erred from
 ‘ the truth.’

5. Photius did not know, who was meant by Aram, nor whether it was a real or fictitious name. But learned men are now well satisfied, that^q hereby is to be understood St. Jerom: and that in this work Theodore aimed to confute Jerom’s three Dialogues against the Pelagians. And it is supposed, that he had also an eye to Augustine.

6. It is observable, that^r in the copies which Photius had of all these works, they were said to be written by Theodore of Antioch. Nevertheless Photius perceived, that they were written by Theodore bishop of Mopsuestia; and had good evidence of it from some of his epistles, which he had read.

7. Theodore’s works were translated into Syriac; Ebedjesu gives this account of them: Theodore^s the commentator ‘ composed one and forty tomes.—A Commentary upon the
 ‘ book of Genesis in three tomes; upon David in five tomes;
 ‘ upon the Twelve Prophets in two tomes; upon Samuel [or
 ‘ the first two books of the Kings] in one tome; upon Job
 ‘ in two tomes; upon Ecclesiastes in one tome; upon Isaiah,
 ‘ and Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, and Daniel, each in one tome:
 ‘ there putting an end to his labours upon the Old Testament.
 ‘ Matthew he explained in one tome; Luke and John in two
 ‘ tomes; the Acts of the apostles in one tome; the epistle
 ‘ to the Romans, the two epistles to the Corinthians, in two
 ‘ tomes; the epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to

^p Εἰς δὲ καὶ τὸ λέγειν αὐτὸν, ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς μὲν ὄντων πειρασθαι τὸν ἀδὰμ, ἐνδείξει δὲ μόνον ὡς μισθῶμεν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, σχηματίζας ὡς τὸν Θεόν. Ibid.

^q Vid. T. Ittigii Diff. de Aramo scriptore ecclesiastico antipelagiano. In App. ad Diff. de Hæresiarchis. p. 466. &c. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 387. Tillem. Theodor. de M. Art. 7. Mem. T. xii. Asseman.

Bib. Or. T. i. p. 402. not. 4. Beauf. H. M. T. ii. p. 466, 467. Hod. de Bib. Text. p. 322. n. 18. Vid. Cod.

177. p. 396. in. Et Conf. cod. 4. p. 8. cod. 38. p. 24. cod. 81. p. 200.

^s Theodorus Commentator

Composuit quadraginta et unum tomm, Ebedjesu Catalog. cap. 19. ap. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 30. &c.

the Philippians, to the Colossians, and the two epistles to the Thessalonians, both the epistles to Timothy, the epistle to Titus, and to Philemon, and to the Hebrews; thus completing his Commentaries upon the whole apostle in five tomes. Ebedjesu afterwards mentions several other works of Theodore. A book concerning the Sacraments: one book entitled Of the Faith: one tome Concerning the Priesthood: two tomes concerning the Holy Spirit: a tome concerning the Incarnation: two tomes against Eunomius: and two other against an author, who asserted sin to be in our nature: two other against Magic:—and moreover five tomes against the Allegorists:—and a book of Jewels, in which his epistles are collected: and a Discourse of Law-giving, wherewith he put an end to his labours.

8. Simeon, who was bishop of Beth-Arsam, or Arsamopolis, in Persia, from the year of Christ 510 to 525, says, that Theodore wrote commentaries upon all the books of the Old and New Testament.

9. According to the Edeffen Chronicle, he began to write commentaries in the year of Christ 402, or the ninth year of his episcopate.

10. I forbear to transcribe Gennadius's chapter concerning Theodore; but would refer to some learned moderns for a farther account of his works. For the present let us make a stand, and review what we have seen in ancient authors.

1. Ebedjesu having mentioned Theodore's Commentaries upon the Twelve Prophets, and upon Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Daniel, adds, that he there put an end to his labours upon the Old Testament. Which may afford an argument, that Theodore did not receive, as sacred and divine scripture, any books written after those of the Jewish canon.

2. He is said to have spoken in disrespectful terms of the

¹ Quinque autem tomis finem imposuit
Commentariis suis in totum Apostolum.

Ibid. p. 33.

² Ac duo alii adversus asserentem,
Peccatum in natura institum esse.

Ib. p. 34.

³ Quinque præterea tomos composuit
Adversus Allegoricos,
Et unum pro Basilio.

Item librum Margaritarum,
In quo Epistolæ ejus collectæ sunt.
Demum Sermonem de Legislatione,
Quo finem lucubrationibus suis im-
posuit. Ib. p. 34. et 35.

⁴ Vid. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. i. 341.

⁵ A Diodoro accepit Theodorus, Mop-
suestiæ in Cilicia, qui omnes quidem tum
Veteris tum Novi Testamenti libros com-
mentatus est. Sim. Beth—Ars. ap. Assem.
ib. p. 348.

⁶ Vid. ib. p. 400.

⁷ Gennad. de Script. Ec. cap. 19.

⁸ Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. Oudin. de
Scr. Ec. T. i. p. 895. Du Pin Bib. T. iii.
p. 90. Tillem. Mem. T. xii. Fabric.
Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 33. T. ix. p. 153. &c.
Pagi Ann. 423. n. xv.—xix.

⁹ Vid. Conc. Constant. ii. app. Labbé.
T. v. p. 451, 452. Conf. Tillem. T. xii.
Theod. de M. art. v. et Du Pin ubi supr.

book of Job, and the Canticles. But* as those accounts appear among the charges and accusations of enemies, there is, in all probability, some misrepresentation. Moreover, as we have seen in Ebedjesu, he wrote a Commentary upon the book of Job: which may amount to a confutation of one part of that charge.

3. Ebedjesu mentions commentaries upon the three gospels only of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, saying nothing particularly of St. Mark. Nevertheless there can be no question made, but he received four gospels, as other Christians did: and we may see proof of it in a fragment to be alleged presently.

4. Theodore, as we are also assured by Ebedjesu, wrote commentaries upon St. Paul's fourteen epistles, particularly upon that to the (A) Hebrews.

5. None of the accounts of his commentaries, which we have seen, are sufficient to satisfy us, which of the catholic epistles were received by him. Unquestionably, he received those, which had been all along received by Christians in general. But what was his opinion concerning the rest, and concerning the book of the Revelation, does not as yet clearly appear, that I know of.

6. Most of Theodore's works are lost. But fragments may be found, chiefly in Latin, and perhaps not fairly represented, in the Acts of the second general council of Constantinople, or the fifth general council, held in 553, as also in Facundus, and in the Greek Chains. We are likewise assured by Fabricius, that^f his Commentary upon the Twelve Prophets is still

p. 90. b. * On dit, que Theodore de Mopsueste [Garnier. ad Mar. Mercat. Diff. i. § 9. p. 320.] regardoit le livre de Job comme une fable tirée du Paganisme, —le Cantique de Salomon comme une chanson d'amoureux—l'ai de la peine à le croire—Il n'y eut personne pendant sa vie, qui l'accusât d'erreur—Il ne fut condamné que près de cent cinquante ans après sa mort, par la cabale de Justinien. J. Bafn. H. de l'Egl. l. viii. ch. v. n. 6. p. 430. Vid. ib. l. x. ch. 6. n. 4. p. 520.

(A) Dr. Joseph Asseman, in a note upon Ebedjesu's Catalogue, says: Epistolas Pauli omnes a Theodoro fuisse explicatas esse, testatur Theodorus. Præfat. in Comment. in eisdem. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 32. Which led me to consult Theodoret's preface to his Commentaries upon St. Paul's Epistles, and his argument to the Epistle to the Hebrews. But I have not found there any

mention made of Theodore's Commentaries. It seems, that Dr. Asseman borrowed this from Dr. Cave, who still says in the new edition of his H. L. T. i. p. 387. in his account of Theodore's Works: Commentarii in 14. D. Pauli Epistolas: quas omnes a Theodoro fuisse explicatas esse, auctor est Theodorus. Præf. in Comm. in Ep. S. Pauli. This mistake is corrected by Fabricius, who seems to have had the same fruitless task imposed upon him by Cave, that I have had from Asseman. Quod vero Epistolas Pauli omnes fuisse explicatas a Theodoro scripserit Theodorus, in ejus Præfatione Commentarii in Epistolas Apostoli, quam laudat eruditissimus Caveus, non reperio. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. ix. p. 163. m.

^f In duodecim Prophetas Commentarius—Integer foliorum 223 servatur Græce in Bibl. Casarea, teste Lambecio. Fabr. B. G. T. ix. p. 162.

in being, in manuscript, in the emperor's library at Vienna, D. B. de Montfaucon, in his *Diarium Italicum*, in his account of things in the library of St. Mark at Venice, speaks^z of its being there, and in the library at Vienna, and in the Vatican: of which^a he speaks again in his *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum* MSS. I am glad there is so good evidence that this work is still extant, and that there are several copies of it; I hope, it may some time be published: it might let us know more fully this writer's manner of interpreting scripture; and, possibly, we might there see his sentiments concerning the disputed books of the New Testament, about which we do not yet distinctly know his opinion.

7. The last work of Theodore in Ebedjesu's Catalogue, is entitled, *A Discourse of Lawgiving, or of the Lawgiver*. As it is not now extant, we cannot say what was in it: but if a conjecture were to be formed, we might be apt to think, the¹ design of it was to shew, that one and the same God was the author of the Old and the New Testament, or of the more ancient and the latter dispensation.

III. I shall now put down a fragment, or passage of Theodore concerning the four gospels, which is prefixed by Dr. Mill to St. John's gospel, taken^k from Corderius's Chain upon that evangelist. As Dr. Mill's New Testament is very common, I need not transcribe the Greek here at length; but I shall endeavour to make a literal version of it.

Says Theodore: 'After^l the Lord's ascension to heaven, the disciples stayed a good while at Jerusalem, visiting the cities in its neighbourhood, preaching chiefly to the Jews; until the great Paul, called by the divine grace, was appointed to preach the gospel to the Gentiles openly. And in process of time, Divine Providence, not allowing them to be confined to any one particular part of the earth, made way for conducting them to remote countries. Peter went to Rome, the others elsewhere. John, in particular, took up his abode at Ephesus, visiting however at seasons the several parts of Asia, and doing much good to the people of that country

^z 'Theodori Antiocheni in xii. Prophetas.' Hic liber nondum editus est. Exstat quoque in Bibliotheca Cæsarea Vienneusi, et in Vaticana Bibliotheca. *Diar. Ital.* p. 39. ^a In Bibliotheca Cæsarea Vindebonorum. Codex clxiii. bombycinus Græcus, Theodori Mopsuesteni in duodecim Prophetas Minores. Biblioth.

Biblioth. MSS. T. i. p. 546. Et vid. in Ind. Gen. Theodor. Mopf. in Scripturam.

¹ Vid. *Asseman. Bib. Or.* T. iii. p. 88. not. 3. ^k Ap. Balth. Corderii.

Caten. in S. Joann. in Proem. Antv. 1630.

^l *Μέλα τὴν εἰς ὁρανὴς ἀναστῆναι τὴν κρῆν ἐπὶ πολλὰ μὲν τοὺς Ἰερουσαλμοὺς ἐνδιδριψάσθαι μαθήτας τῷ χρόνῳ. κ. λ.*

' by his discourses. About ^a this time the other evangelists,
 ' Matthew, Mark, and Luke, published their gospels: which
 ' were soon spread all over the world, and were received by
 ' all the faithful in general with great regard. Nevertheless,
 ' the Christians of Asia, having a great opinion of the abili-
 ' ties and faithfulness of John, and considering that he had
 ' been with Jesus from the beginning, even before Matthew,
 ' and that he had been greatly favoured by the Lord, brought
 ' to him the other books of the gospels, desiring to know his
 ' opinion concerning them. And he declared his approbation
 ' of them, saying, that what they had written was agreeable
 ' to truth; but that some miracles, which might be of great
 ' use if recorded, were omitted. He said, moreover, that
 ' whereas they had written of the coming of Christ in the
 ' flesh, it was fit that the things concerning his Divinity also
 ' should be recorded. The brethren thereupon earnestly de-
 ' sired him to write those things, which he esteemed needful
 ' to be known, and which he saw to have been omitted by the
 ' rest: with which request he complied. And he was in-
 ' duced to begin immediately with the doctrine of Christ's
 ' Deity. After which he proceeded to the account of the
 ' things said and done by the Lord in the flesh.'

It will now be proper to make some remarks.

1. This account of the occasion of St. John's writing his gospel agrees very much with that in ^a Eusebius of Cæsarea. I mention this observation in the first place, because it is likely, that the occasion of St. John's gospel was the thing primarily intended in that part of our author's work, from which this passage is taken.

2. The late date of the first three gospels is here supposed: they were not written, until after that the first twelve disciples had for a good while preached the gospel to the Jews at Jerusalem, and in the neighbouring cities; nor until after St. Paul had been called, and had openly preached the gospel to the Gentiles; nor until after that St. Peter had been at Rome; nor, as it seems, until after, or at least, about the time of St. John's taking up his abode at Ephesus in Asia.

3. It seems to be supposed, that all the first three gospels were written about the same time.

4. Those gospels were soon spread abroad among Christians all over the world. This is expressly said by our author, as

^a Γινώσκαι τοίνυν ἐν τούτοις τὰς λοιπὰς εὐαγγελιστὰς ἐκδοσὶς, ματθαίον τε καὶ μαρκον.—
^a See p. 225—227.

well as that they were received by all with great regard. And indeed the accounts given, both by Theodore and by Eusebius, of the occasion of St. John's writing his gospel, afford good evidence, that the first three gospels soon came into the hands of many Christians. Before St. John wrote his gospel, the Christians in Asia had seen and read the other three; and they asked St. John his opinion concerning them, and he approved them. There can be no reason to doubt, that about this time, and soon after they were written, those three gospels were delivered to other Christians, beside those in Asia.

5. The publishing of St. John's gospel, which he wrote now at the request of the believers at Ephesus, would contribute to their being yet more public, and looked upon by all with the greatest veneration. And from this time forward, it is reasonable to think, the four gospels were collected in one code or volume. And St. John's gospel, now added to the rest, would occasion a diligent comparing of all of them together, and a careful attention to the several accounts of each.

I now proceed.

IV. That Theodore was a celebrated commentator, we have seen: that he was also a celebrated preacher, and admired as such, at Antioch, and Constantinople, and all over the East, may be collected from testimonies in ° Facundus.

V. 1. Theodore, as the same Facundus ° says, lived and died in the communion of the church. And his great reputation is manifest from Sozomen and Theodoret, before cited. Nevertheless afterwards, upon occasion of the Pelagian and Nestorian controversies, there ° were great debates about his sentiments; and not a few moderns ° call him the parent both of Pelagianism and Nestorianism: whilst others allow ° indeed his holding the Pelagian principle, but think the charge of

° Theodosio Imperatori, qui per idem tempus mundi regebat gubernacula, sic dicit: Theodorus enim, quem quando dicimus, virum dicimus in episcopatu clarum finem habentem, et quinquaginta pene annis fortiter repugnantem cunctis hæresibus, et in expositionibus, quas in omnibus ecclesiis orientalibus faciebat, et quibus in regia civitate valde esset comprobatus apparet. &c. Facund. l. ii. c. 2. p. 23. Vid. et l. x. cap. 1. p. 148. E. p — in cujus pace atque honore defunctus idem Theodorus. Id. l. x. c. 1. p. 148. C. Vid. et l. ii. c. 2. q Vid. S. Basnag. Ann. 550. n. vii.—ix. 551. n. x. &c. 553. n. xvii. &c. Tillem. Theodore de M. art.

4. Mem. T. xii.

° Theodorus Mopsuestenus Pelagianorum æque ac Nestorianorum parens. Assen. ad Chr. Edess. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 402. not. 3.

Hinc Theodorus merito Pelagianorum pater audit, ejusque sectatores Chaldei Nestoriani de originali peccato usque in præsentem diem male sentiunt. — Nam Nestoriani Pelagianum dogma expresse docuere, ut probat Pagius ad annum 428. n. xvi. hac in re a magistro suo Nestorio deficiente, qui de peccato originali recte sentiebat. Assen. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 34. not. 1. Conf. Pagi Ann. 423. n. xv.—xviii.

° Vid. S. Basnag. Ann. 428. n. 7.

Nestorianism not so clear. Divers passages of his, alleged by Facundus[†], seem not reconcileable therewith: however, we have seen, that Photius, in his accounts of Theodore's works, scruples not to accuse him of being in the Nestorian principle. And in his epistles he says, that[‡] Nestorius borrowed his abominable doctrine from Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia: but bishop R. Montague[§], in a note upon Photius, vindicates both those great men.

2. I shall take here two passages of Theodore, one out of his commentary upon St. John's gospel, the other out of his commentary upon the Acts of the apostles; as they are cited, in Latin, in[¶] the Acts of the fore-mentioned council of Constantinople, in 553, and in Greek, in the emperor Justinian's confession of the right faith, or his edict issued in[‡] 545, or rather in[§] 551; against the three chapters, as they are called, that is, the works of our Theodore, the writings of Theodoret against Cyril of Alexandria, and the letter of Ibas bishop of Edessa, about the year 436, to Maris a Persian. They are alleged in the way of reproach, and are among charges brought against him: and perhaps the quotations are not quite exact and fair; nevertheless, they may be of some use to us, in forming an idea of Theodore's judgment, or way of thinking.

In^b his commentary upon St. John's gospel, he says, 'that
' when Thomas made that confession to Christ, *My Lord and*

[†] Facund. l. ix.

[‡] Phot. Ep. 1.

p. 7. f. Vid. et p. 11. m.

[§] Intelligit Mopsuestenum, et Tarsensem episcopos, qui et doctissimi et orthodoxi erant, aut habebantur, præcipue Diodorus, et a Basilio, Chrysostomo, ac aliis laudantur. Nec nisi mortui in suspicionem hæreseos venire, et sequiorum calamis punguntur. Qui mihi non persuadent, fuisse hæreseos labe infectos. Montac. Not. ad Phot. Ep. i. p. 46.

[¶] Thomas, quidem, cum sic credidisset, *Dominus meus et Deus meus* dicit: non ipsum Dominum et Deum dicens, (non enim resurrectionis scientia docebat et Deum esse eum qui resurrexit) sed quasi pro miraculo facto Deum collaudat.

— Ut quum ad ipsum accessissent, tanquam Salvatorem, et omnium bonorum auctorem, et doctorem veritatis, ab ipso, utpote auctore bonorum, et doctore veritatis vocarentur: sicut omnibus hominibus, quamcunque sectam sequentibus, consuetudo est ab ipso dogmatis inventore vocari, ut Platonici et Epicuræi, Manichæi et Marcionistæ, et siquidem tales dicuntur.

Eodem modo et nos nominari Christianos judicaverunt Apostoli, tanquam per hoc certum facientes, quod ipsius doctrinam oportet adtendere. Conc. Constantin. ii. Col. iv. ap. Labbé. T. v. p. 440, 441.

[‡] Vid. Cav. de Justiniano. H. L. T. i. p. 509. et Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. xi. p. 441.

[§] Pagi ann. 551. n. v. Basnag. ann. 551. n. 7, 8.

^b Οὗτος δὲ καὶ τὴν ὁμολοσίαν θάρρα, ἢ ἐπιτηψήλαφται τῶν χειρῶν καὶ τῆς πλευρᾶς τῆ κυριᾶ μίλα τὴν ἀναστάσι, το, ο κυριος μη και Θιος μη, ειπει, μη ιρησθαι περι τῆ Χριστε παρα τῷ θάρρα, (ε γαρ ειναι λεγει τοι Χριστον Θιον) ἀλλ ἐπι τῷ παραδόξῳ τῆς ἀναστάσις ἐκπλασίῳ τοι θάρραν ὑμνησαι τον Θεον εἰραῖνα τον Χριστον. Το δι χειρον, οἱ ἐν τῇ τῶν ἀραξίων τῶν ἀποστόλων γινόμενη παρ' αὐτῶ δίδει ἐμπειρία, συζητητων ο αὐτῶς θεοδωρος τον Χριστον Πλάτων, και μανηχαίρι, και ἐπικηρω, και μαρκιωνι, λεγει, οἱ ὡσπερ ἐκείνων ἑκάστος εὐραμενος οὐκ εἰσεν δόγμα τῆς αὐτῶ μαθηλευσαντίας πιστῶν καὶ καλίσσθαι Πλάτωνικῆς, και μανηχαίρις, και ἐπικηρικῆς, και μαρκιωνίτας, τον ομοιον τροπον και τῷ Χριστῷ εὐραμενῶ το δόγμα, εἰ

‘ my God, [John xx. 28.] he did not call Christ Lord and God; but being astonished at the great miracle of his resurrection, and the full evidence of it, which had been afforded to him, he praised God, who had raised Christ from the dead. Nor is the being raised from the dead a proof of deity.’ And in his commentary upon the Acts of the apostles, he says: ‘ As the Platonics and Epicureans, and the men of other sects, are called from their masters, who first taught the principles professed by them; so Christians are called from Christ, whom they have received as the teacher of truth, and their Saviour, and the author of all good. And the apostles therefore gave us this denomination, that thereby we might be reminded of our obligation to adhere to Christ’s doctrine.’

That is the sense of those two passages, as may appear to such as will compare the Latin and Greek at the bottom of the pages.

3. I conclude this chapter with transcribing below ‘ the charges brought against Theodore, and the principles ascribed to him, by Simeon Beth-Arsam before-mentioned, as the passage may entertain some of my readers: though indeed he there, and elsewhere ‘ speaks to the like purpose also of Diodorus, whom he considers as his master; and Paul of Samosata as master of both. But Theodore of Mopsuestia is the worst of all, having added to, and farther established the Unitarian, Jewish sentiments, which he had received from them (B).

αὐτὴ τῆς Χριστιανικῆς καλεῖσθαι. Ap. Chron. Pasch. p. 361. et Concil. Labb. T. v. p. 706.

‘ A Diodoro accepit Theodorus Mopsuestia in Cilicia, qui omnes tum Veteris tum Novi Testamenti libros commentatus est. Verum in cunctis ipsis commentariis et sermonibus Judaicam de Christo opinionem tradit, Diodoro, Pauloque Samosateno præceptoribus suis consentiens. Quæ vero a Simone Mago, a Paulo, et a Diodoro asserbantur, hæc ille amplificavit, confirmavitque, asserens Christum hominem esse creatum, factum, mortalem, consubstantialiæ nobis, Filium adoptivum, et Templum Dei æterni, non Filium naturalem Dei esse, sed per gratiam et adoptionem. — A Theodoro accepit Nestorius. &c. Ap. Assen. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 348, 349. ‘ A Paulo

accepit Diodorus Tarsi Ciliciæ episcopus. — Christum vero ipsum hominem existimavit creatum, factum, mortalem, consubstantialiæ nobis, et Filium per gratiam, Pauli Samosatani præceptoris sui vestigiis presse inhærens. Ib. p. 348. in.

(B) Some learned moderns think, that Diodorus of Tarsus, in his old age, in opposing the Apollinarians, espoused the same doctrine concerning Christ with Paul of Samosata, Marcellus of Galatia, and Photinus: which, as they say, was likewise the opinion of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius. Vid. Garner. ad Marium Mercatorem. T. ii. p. 317—319. et Pagi ann. 428. xix. Et Conf. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 361. et Tillem. Mem. T. viii. Diodore de Tarfe.



This is the first of two pages.
The second page will contain the
rest of the document.

I am,
Very truly yours,

[Signature]

[Name]
[Address]
[City, State, Zip]

[The page contains faint, illegible markings and bleed-through from the reverse side.]